

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

**REGAL ALASKA HOTEL
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA**

March 13, 1996

Volume II

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Raymond Collins, Chairman
Pollock Simon, Jr., Vice Chairman
Angela Demientieff, Secretary
Jack Reakoff
William Derendoff
Gail Vanderpool
Harold Huntington

Vince Mathews, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Call us to order and note that Harold has joined us this morning, so we have seven out of nine members present. We're under new business. And the first item up would be proposals, at least that's where I'm at.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Did you have anything?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The only question I need to know is how you want to proceed with these. What we've been doing in other meetings is I would introduce the proposal, tell you where you can find it in your book and give you a summary of public comments. And then staff would give you analysis and then from there you could have motions and that. We can do it differently if you like, it's up to you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That sounds reasonable.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then I'll start. Can everyone hear this out there. We don't really have the feedback.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Are you going to follow the suggested outline in the book here where you've highlighted the ones that affect us

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: starting with 42.

MR. MATHEWS: If everyone is comfortable. That's about two pages into your hand covered book is basically a chronological list of the proposals. First starting out with ones that deal with directly in your region and then they break out into ones that you have influence on in other regions. Is that comfortable with everyone? Okay.

The first proposal is Proposal #1, this is a statewide proposal from Fish & Wildlife Service. And it's a statewide proposal to allow the taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle on Federal public lands in all units as long as that vehicle is not in motion. The proposal would not change the existing regulations with respect to the taking of wildlife from a boat.

Public comment on that, I don't have public comments on Proposal 1 but I can give you a summary many of the Regional Council's actions on that, so I'll just go down the list on that. Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta supported the proposal. North Slope supported the proposal. SouthCentral supported the proposal and -- I do have some comments for Proposal 1, so I'll get to those also. Eastern Interior supported the proposal with a modification to remove the language, land and air. In the proposal it says taking wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle when the vehicle is in motion. They modified the proposal to delete land or air. So that's what I know of Council's actions.

We do have two -- three public comments. Alaska Department of Fish & Game. And John's here, right? John, did you want me to summarize State positions

MR. MORRISON: Will you give my speech for me (ph) on that?

MR. MATHEWS: No. No, I didn't get the double space for it, but do you want me to summarize State positions on these or do you want to do that?

MR. MORRISON: On this Proposal 1, you know, our position is the State is

MR. MATHEWS: Well, it's up to you, John, on that 'cause we can keep you working up here or

MR. MORRISON: I've had to do this at all the Council meetings is to point out that the statement in opposition was in response to the original statement from the staff on that in which they failed to line out that last sentence in that first paragraph and made it sound like it was doing away with the regulation against shooting from a moving vehicle. And after that was corrected I forgot to tell the folks at the staff that it's okay, it's fine with us now because the regulation pretty much matches the State, so we're no longer in opposition to what's there.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The other one we got was from Kathryn Kennedy of Ninilchik. She's concerned about this proposal. Motorized use creates opportunities for harassment, illegal pursuit and poaching of wildlife. In addition, vehicles create air and noise pollution, destroy fragile terrain, and provide unfair advantage for some hunters. We recommend the Board work to prevent damage to wildlife and habitat by maintaining strong monitoring and regulatory oversight of these machines. I'm sorry, that was Matt Singer and not Kathryn Kennedy. Matt Singer is of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance. Kathryn Kennedy of Ninilchik supports Proposal #1.

I failed to point out that there's the blue cover books like the one in front of William. There's one in front of Ray and there's a public comment one on the table back there. Those contain exact copies of the letters that were sent, so if you want to look further into what actually was said or just get more idea of their intent. The summaries are done by staff and we may have missed something, so those are available to you. They have tabs in there by proposal numbers.

And that's the summary of the public comment on Proposal 1, so I will turn it over to staff to present the analysis.

MR. FISHER: Thanks, Vince. Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, my name is Dave Fisher. I work in the Subsistence Office. I'm filling in for Mr. Conrad Guenther today. Conrad is on vacation. But anyway, I do similar work similar to what Conrad does. He has some of the interior regions. I work out in the Bristol Bay area and also Yukon Delta Game Management Units 9, 17 and 18. Although I'm not all that familiar with the interior area, but I do have some fellas here today that will help me a little bit if I get stuck or you have some tough questions for me. Thank you.

With that I'll go ahead and give you a little overview here of Proposal 1 and what our staff analysis is. Early on the general provision for prohibiting the taking of wildlife from a motorized vehicle, this was adopted from ADF&G regulations when the Federal people took over subsistence in 1990.

At that time the only exception for taking caribou was in Unit 23. And since that time the Federal Subsistence Board, as you know, has added regulations and exceptions for the taking of caribou and/or moose from stationary snowmachines in Units 22, 25 26 and also since in the Fish & Game, they've liberalized their regulations to allow the taking of game from a motorized land or air vehicle as long as the engine is not running and the vehicle is not moving.

Exceptions to this is caribou may be taken from a snowmachine with the engine running in Unit 23 and from a moving boat in Unit 26.

Currently the Federal Subsistence regulations prohibit the taking of wildlife from a motorized vehicle except in Units 22, 23, 25 and 26. In these units caribou can be taken from a stationary snowmobile. In Units 22 and 25 moose may be taken from a stationary snowmachine and caribou may also be taken from motor driven boats in 23, 25 and 26 and moose from a motor driven boat in 25. However, in all the other game management units the Federal regulations are still somewhat more restrictive than the State regulations. So this proposal is to make the Federal regulations more consistent with State regulations.

As Vince alluded to earlier, all the other Councils have passed this and/or modified it with the exception of the Bristol Bay Council which meets next week and then, of course, our meeting here today. That's all I have. I'll answer any questions that you may have if you have any.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions? If there's no questions does someone have a motion concerning this proposal?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt this proposal #1.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Moved by Jack to adopt #1. Is there a second to that?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Seconded by Harold. Discussion of that motion?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the concern by the Alaska Wildlife Alliance as to the harassment of the animals by motored vehicles is addressed in the anti-harassment regulations that are currently in force and access to wildlife population by motorized vehicles is allowed by ANILCA, so as long as the

engine's shut off, you know, it's consistent with State regulations. The Federal regulations should read the same.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any other comments? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

That's yes votes for all seven members present. Motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: this brings us up to Proposal 42 which is found in your book on page -- starting on page 5. This deals with brown bear in Unit 24. And it would expand the Northwest Alaska brown bear management area to encompass all remaining Federal public lands including the Dalton Highway corridor within Unit 24. This proposal was submitted by Jack Reakoff.

And let me see what we have for public comment on 42. The Koyukuk River Local Fish & Game and Advisory Committee supported the proposal because all residents of Unit 24 can participate in the Northwest brown bear management area. Alaska Department of Fish & Game is neutral on this proposal. And if John would have the opportunity to clarify or elaborate on that. That's all the comments we've received on Proposal 42 analysis.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Dave?

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The primary reasons for changing this regulation would be residents in the eastern part of 24 have not been provided this same limit of brown bears as other c&t eligible users in Unit 24. And another reason would be that the change in the regulation would eliminate the high cost of transporting the skin to Fairbanks, Barrow, Galena or Kotzebue for sealing by the Fish & Game.

There isn't a lot of wildlife information on bears that I'm aware of in Unit 24. The information that we have indicates that the population is stable to slightly increasing. We do have some harvest information that shows that the average annual harvest in Unit 24 is approximately 12 to 13 bears per year. And if you take a look at this and look at a sustainable harvest, annual harvest rate of around 4 percent, which is used in other areas for wildlife management, you can kind of factor

that in and you can come up with an average of somewhere around 31 to 38 bears could be harvested yearly in Unit 24 without affecting the population and still maintain a stable population

Basically this proposal would extend the Northwest Alaska brown bear management area to encompass the community of Wiseman and allow Wiseman residents to harvest brown bears on Federal public lands. As you know subsistence hunters can harvest one bear every regulatory year in that Northwest Alaska brown bear management area.

Also, the residents of Wiseman could possess the hide and the skulls of bears harvested within the management area without having to have them sealed by the State, however, a State registration permit would still be required.

A similar proposal to extend this management area has been -- will come up before the Board of Game this spring. And I'm not sure exactly what's in that proposal. Maybe Vince could shed a little light on that for us.

MR. MATHEWS: It'll take me a second to find it in the book. I think it's Proposal 3. Well, I'm not finding it quick enough for you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think Jack can speak to it. He submitted it.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there anything you want to say

MR. REAKOFF: A similar proposal to this proposal requesting the State Game Board to extend the brown bear area across the entire Unit 24.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Questions of anyone?

MR. FISHER: I have just more --

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'm sorry.

MR. FISHER: 25 more seconds here. Thank you.

If this proposal passes it's probably going to probably increase the harvest somewhat, but the staff didn't feel there would be any danger of any type of over-harvest. And basically the staff recommendation was to extend the area and this would allow the community of Wiseman to fully participate with their subsistence activities in the brown bear management area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you. Any questions? Hearing none do we have a motion?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to adopt Proposal 42.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack moves to adopt. Is there a second?

MS. VANDERPOOL: I second.

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think Gail beats you. Gail seconds. Discussion of the motion?

All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay. It's yes votes for all seven members present. Motion carries.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings us up to Proposal 43. And I'll just introduce it into the record and we won't go through public comment. You'll see why in a second.

Proposal 43 is dealing with moose in Unit 21(B), a portion of that. It would close a portion of the area to non-subsistence uses except by residents of Unit 21(B), Tanana and Galena.

During our meeting in Eastern Interior meeting, Fort Yukon, we received a fax from the Tanana Tribal Council which is

the one that authored this proposal. On February 5th they sent one to the Eastern Interior Council saying the Tribal Council held a special meeting on January 30th, 1996 and voted to rescind their proposal that was submitted to the Federal Eastern Interior Alaska Subsistence Regional Council for the Nowitna River in Unit 21(B) for moose hunting. And the letter goes on. So they have rescinded or withdrawn their proposal 43.

John Star is a resident and leader from Tanana and serves on the Eastern Interior Regional Council and he confirmed at that meeting that the Tribal Council withdrew the proposal. So 43 has been withdrawn.

Okay. That brings us up to Proposal 44 which deals with moose in Unit 21(D). It would close Federal public lands in 21(D) within a half mile of the Koyukuk River from 40 miles above its mouth to the lower end of the Three-Day Slough to moose hunting during the September 5th through 25th season to hunters who are neither residents of Unit 21(D) Huslia or Ruby.

We've had quite a few comments on that. And let me get to that section. I'll try to be brief on this. You do have in the blue book and you have another summary of Western comments, but on proposal 44, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposes this proposal and John may want to elaborate on this. The proposal addresses a real problem in that there are too many hunters are taking too many bulls in the area described. A more realistic approach alleviating the problem is to adopt the proposed regulation being submitted to Alaska Board of Game. And I think that will come up in discussion as to what the proposal is.

The middle Yukon River local Fish & Game Advisory Committee supports the proposal if the Board of Game does not adopt a similar proposal that's before them. Let's see if I can find that. I have some notes here. Well, we'll go on.

Jay Hollanbeck of Fairbanks, I'm opposed to closing the Koyukuk. It's not a good thing to limit it to local residents; maybe for State residents only.

Robert Fox of Fairbanks also opposed this proposal. With a little extra measure of wolf and bear harvest, more than enough moose will reach maturity to sustain the existing level of hunter harvest both for subsistence and urban hunters. By closing the area to white hunters, you will only force them to concentrate in other areas impacting other populations. Further, you'll see a rebellion by hunters and open hostilities that hurt many and benefit no one. There's no shred of evidence that there's any problem with the animal populations. Just because moose is not standing on the bank for subsistence hunter is not justification to exclude all other users.

Greg Hoffman of Fairbanks wrote he is opposed to the proposal. Existing regulations already provide a late September antlerless season in addition to a liberal bull season. Rural residents are also provided with either sex hunt in February. The current population is healthy.

Todd Graham of Anchorage, I see no cause for change in regulations. According to the area biologist the moose population is healthy and the fall count shows the cow numbers rising.

Rick Schikora of Fairbanks opposes basically saying the population is pretty substantial since there is a six day cow season. There's plenty of opportunity to harvest moose.

John Huber, Jr. of Fairbanks also opposed. What keeps subsistence users from accessing the important subsistence areas nearest my community when resources are scarce?

The Koyukuk Tribal Council supports the proposal. They passed a resolution which I need to read into the record if I can find it quick enough. It was passed on the 25th of January, 1996, whereas the Koyukuk Tribal Council is a federally recognized government body for the Native village of Koyukuk. And whereas, the Tribal Council recognizes the massive taking of moose during the moose hunting season in the Yukon/Koyukuk region. And whereas, the taking of moose creates a major decline in meeting subsistence needs of local residents. And whereas, during moose seasons spoiled moose carcasses are found

at shipping points and moose meat is left on the banks or beaches of villages unknown to local residents. And whereas, there is a need to submit a proposal such as this to the Federal and State governments to bring this concern before the proper Board for action.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Koyukuk Tribal Council gives full support to Proposal 44. And be it further resolved that the Koyukuk Tribal Council requests that the Federal Subsistence Board work with communities in the Koyukuk region to resolve this long-standing excessive taking of moose problem.

Let's see, the next comment we've gotten from is from the Louden -- did I pronounce it right?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Louden.

MR. MATHEWS: Louden Village Council of from Galena, correct? They support the proposal. Village people lack the resources to go great distances to obtain their moose. Gas is expensive. More and more non-residents and non-locals are converging on areas normally hunted by locals. The past five years has seen an increase of 30 percent in the number of hunters and a 36 percent increase in the number of moose taking along with a 13 percent decline in moose taken by the locals. There's been a 72 percent increase in the number of resident hunters and 125 percent increase in the number of non-resident hunters. Local people cannot afford to compete with the urban hunters on vacation. Between Ruby and Galena, is that Yuki,

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yuki, yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. Yuki River Drainage moose population is decimated. And they have for those that are wondering, a long list of other reasons why they support this proposal and it's copied in those blue books, but this is a summary of some of those major points. And to my knowledge that's all the public comment we've received on Proposal 44.

On this proposal David Fisher and Tom Hurley (sic) the refuge manager from Koyukuk Nowitna refuge will be --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kanuti.

MR. MATHEWS: Kanuti -- no.

MR. ELEY: Tom Eley.

MR. MATHEWS: Tom Eley. Well, that Tom. Tom Eley from Koyukuk Nowitna will be assisting in presenting the biological analysis of this proposal. Sorry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Analysis?

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Federal and State seasons for harvest limits in 21(D) are very similar as you know, however, the State's February residency is five days longer. Another item that concerns regulations is you remember back in '93 there was a proposal that was submitted and passed by the Federal Board to open this season five days earlier. I believe that was in September or late August. And then there was a proposal that was submitted the following year and also passed by the Board to rescind that earlier season. Apparently there was some confusion there in the areas as far as where the boundaries are, the navigable waters and the State controlled lands, private lands and where the Federal lands are. And I think 100 was fined (ph) if I'm not mistaken. That's their analysis that Conrad passed on to me, so that proposal was changed.

As you know, rural residents of 21(D) and also Ruby and Huslia have c&t for moose in 21(D). All lands and waters addressed by this proposal lie within the Koyukuk control use area.

That's -- oh, I do have some information on harvest here for you. And this is primarily derived from the hunter check station there managed by Fish & Game. And from 1983 to 1995 the number of hunters has increased from 164 to over -- well, actually 400 and -- almost 450. And on moose harvest has also

increased from 65 to 286. The check station data also shows that the number of resident hunters and the quantity of moose harvested has remained fairly constant over the years. In other words, people are still getting their -- there's more people, but the people are still getting their animals.

As far as the proposal goes, a large portion of the area that's addressed by this proposal lies within the uniform coding unit 803 and harvest ticket data from this coding unit indicates that the number of hunters and moose harvested in this coding unit has increased only slightly between 1983 and 1994. Although the hunting activity in this area is not reported to have increased significantly over the last 12 years, the level of boat traffic in the area has significantly increased as you're well aware of.

That's basically all I have. I'll have some sort of a summary of the staff recommendations here, but I'd like to have Tom brief us on the biological aspect of the moose population in the proposed area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What was the '83 number of boats? A hundred and something you said or

MR. FISHER: 164.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: 164.

MR. FISHER: That's the number of hunters.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Number of hunters?

MR. FISHER: Number of hunters is 164.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, okay.

MR. FISHER: 164 in 1983 and that has increased to about 450 in 1995.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And the actual hunter success has increased or

MR. FISHER: Well, moose harvest over the same period of time from 65 to 286.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. But in relation to the number of hunters it looks like there's

MR. FISHER: More hunters.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, more hunters, but they're -- and they're more successful in taking moose which is interesting. 286 to 450 and 65 to 164.

MR. ELEY: But not in the subject area. Maybe I can talk about that

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, okay.

MR. FISHER: Thanks, Tom.

MR. ELEY; Yeah, this proposal by Harold responds to a legitimate concern the local people have out in my country about the increased numbers of hunters that they see, increased number of boats, people putting their boat in at the Yukon River Bridge or Fairbanks and coming down river and then going up the Koyukuk and hunting. And if you'll look at this map over here, a GIS map that we've produced with Gana-a' Yoo Corporation, our Native corporation, let me just show you a couple of things.

The focus of all this is really is this Three-Day Slough areas where I talked about yesterday where we have areas that have 12 moose per square mile. People are coming down river, going up the Koyukuk with the idea of hunting here. That's where the bulk of the boats are going and that's the bulk of the intent of most of the non-local hunters.

The problem is that they go up the Koyukuk here and particularly this area here which is called the Long Stretch which is the area where the people from Harold's village and also Nulato and some of the Galena people hunt. So these boats are all going through this area up here. We checked all the

camps along here and we endeavor every year to check every camp whether it's a local person or non-local person to talk about wanton waste and other issues, littering. And there are only two or three camps in this area that's Harold's dealing with in this proposal that are non-local people. The bulk of them are going on up here.

The problem is that as they go up here they're hunting as they motor along in their boat. And as they said, the kill or the harvest has been very consistent in this area that Harold wants to close here. Very consistent. In 1983 there were five bulls killed. In 1994 there were five bulls -- or five moose taken. The percentage taken between local people and non-local people have varied. In 1983 five moose were taken in that area, four were taken by local hunters. In 1984 14 were taken, four were taken by local hunters. In 1992 17 were taken in that area, two by local hunters. '93 eight were taken, seven by local hunters. So it's been very variable. '94 five and two.

The problem is that most of these hunters as they're going up the river in their boats are looking for moose that are on the riverbank which would be below ordinary high water, thus, fall out of the Federal system and into the State system. It's in navigable waters. So although Harold wants to stop them from hunting on the banks which I empathize with and support to some extent, it's not going to do it because the bulk of the non-local hunters are going on up the river to Three-Day Slough anyway. So the harvest in this area is -- has stayed relatively consistent, maybe increased a little bit. The moose densities in the area here are moderate and there's some concern about the population up at Three-Day Slough in that it's probably higher than it should be, 12 moose per square mile or nine moose per square mile, is not sustainable -- probably not sustainable over a long term. Like Laura Reid talked about yesterday. We have to be concerned with what is sustainable over the long period. And while it's nice to have 12 moose up there that's probably not sustainable. So there might be an impetus actually to lower the population up there a little bit, so we really need the hunting up there to keep that population from eating itself out of house and home.

The problem is, of course, that they traverse this country that's hunted by the Koyukuk people and the Nulato people and some of the Galena people.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions?

MR. FISHER: Mr.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. FISHER: Mr. Chairman, the staff felt that it was -- this proposal would probably not significantly reduce the moose hunting and the harvest in the -- in this area unless the State passes a similar proposal. I think that was pretty well explained by Tom that -- the area there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And if the State passed it, it would still be open to every State resident because they all qualify as subsistence, is that correct?

MR. ELEY: Yeah, let me answer that. The State has a proposal -- and actually I don't think the State proposed it. Let me tell you who proposed it. The Middle Yukon Advisory Committee has a proposal for this area not only just this stretch here, but -- let me make sure it hasn't been changed here, but the whole Unit 21 and it would require the hunter when they get to the check station and that would be local and non-local, under the State proposal to declare themselves a sport hunter or general hunter or a subsistence hunter. If they declare themselves a subsistence hunter they could hunt from the 1st of September to the 25th and from the 1st of February to the 10th of February. And they could take one moose during that time frame. The situation would be though, that if you hunted as a subsistence hunter, when you came back to the check station you would either have to turn your antlers over to the Department of Fish & Game who would render them not as a trophy, that is they would cut them off the skull so it wouldn't be a trophy anymore. And in all probability the State would give the antlers back to the individual.

If you declared yourself a sport hunter or general

hunter you could take one cow or one bull during the season of 5 September to 25 September, but it would be required to be a 50 inch antlers or four brow tines. The idea on this according to the Advisory Committee would be that if they thought if we put a 50 inch limitation under the State system that that's going to discourage people that are coming all the way from Anchor Point in some cases up to Three-Day Slough if they can hunt in other areas and have a 50 inch limitation. In the past there hasn't been a 50 inch limitation in this area except for non-residents, non-Alaska residents, non-Alaska residents. So this is a different -- this is another proposal.

It's a State proposal and it will require the hunter when they get to the check station to declare themselves one or the other. You can't go out there and say, well, geez, if I don't find a big bull then I'll be a subsistence hunter and take a small bull. You can't do that.

Whether this is going to work or not I don't know. It's certainly -- I think, in some ways has a lot of potential to work. It just depends.

And the other problem with Harold's proposal, although like I said it does respond to a valid concern on people. They see more and more boats every year coming through Galena. And there's concern about wanton waste of meat and concern about littering and we've dealt with that as an enforcement issue and, unfortunately, we've had poor success with our local magistrate as far as wanton waste cases. He doesn't seem to be very sympathetic, but the problem is that in this area that we're addressing here most of the moose are taken between -- below ordinary high water so this proposal wouldn't be effective anyway in reducing the number of hunters.

It'll cause confusion and again, you could end up with some sort of enforcement problems the local people might be caught up in, which is what happened when we had the earlier season. The 1st through the 4th of September under the earlier regulations was open only to subsistence hunter, not anybody else. Well, that was great except the State said anything below ordinary high water is State land and the State season is not

open then. And then one individual local hunter got cited for hunting during the closed season -- the closed State season on State waters, if you will.

So this is an issue that's going to be dealt with, I think, more and more, but as opposed to most areas where we have a biological problem we really don't have a biological problem yet. We have a lot of moose here, you know, enough to go around, but certainly in the Three-Day Slough area.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. SIMON: I have some comments. We talked about this and our Allakaket River Advisory Committee meeting last month. Of course, a lot of people were complaining about wanton waste and our committee wished that something could be done about wanton waste because if it means that this is the only way of getting meat on our table, that's why we're concerned. Tim Osborne from Galena was at our meeting. He always goes to our meeting. And we talked about this and told him that maybe they could have the check station further down the Koyukuk River, even to Galena, 'cause when sport hunters can leave the area with the meat and then what happens they might have to meet by the check station, but anything could happen from there on to their home. That's what we hear from the local peoples, you know. That's a big concern. So you know, this sport hunters are not look at hunter selection (ph) for hunters from the Fairbanks area or something. You know, they have this high powered boat that they could hunt with. And we don't have that kind of boats in our villages. They're cruising up there where the (indiscernible) there's a boat and they could get to the hunting areas ahead of us. Or if they see a moose somewhere along the bank they get the moose ahead of us. That's one of our big concerns that we discussed at our Allakaket Advisory Committee meeting.

MR. ELEY: We've heard that expressed several times in the villages. One of the concerns that was expressed to me by one of the elders in Fai- -- or in Galena about this proposal

was that he was afraid that if there was a perceived closure of the lower part of the river it might force more hunters farther up river toward Huslia. And I know that the people in Huslia are not interested in having more people up in their country, so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I'd like to make a comment and add a little bit to that. I met briefly with the Huslia City Council and the Tribal Council and it seems like they were concerned, very concerned about the bull/cow ratio in that area, in the whole Koyukuk River area from the mouth. And they were for this proposal because of the bull/cow ratio. And that it caused too much traffic with -- affect be a successful hunt for a lot of local people. And that was what the tribal council and the City Council, that was the information I got. I don't have it in writing or anything, but I just wanted to be heard what they spoke, so they were for that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions or comments? Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to give my analysis on the proposal. You know, it's been a problem for oh, since boats started coming up the river in the '60s really, but it's eventually gotten worse to the point where it's out of control and there's nothing being really done about it. The State Department of Fish & Game has come up with some band aid solutions to our problem and there has nothing really been achieved through the Department of Fish & Game.

And this proposal is not exactly cutting off nonresident hunters from the area. They can still go anyplace along the river and get out of the boat and walk a half mile back to the lakes and get a moose, you know. No problem. That's where all the moose is anyway, back in the lakes at least a half a mile off the river. But as the years gone by you see more and more moose hanging (ph) up on the beaches, you know. Like I go upriver probably three or four times during the hunting season and I see a lot of moose hanging up and I see moose hanging up for a week, rainy weather, you know that moose meat is no more

good and it's happened a lot of times. And you know, nothing is being done about it and this is just a lot of moose meat that's going to waste.

And also there's -- I think there's so much moose up in the Three-Day Slough area, you know, that's where everybody is heading anyway because there's been reports from before that they found 14 dead moose up on one sand bar in the Three-Day Slough area, you know, by hunters that, you know -- that should tell you how much moose there is up there and that's where people are going. But in the process, you know, they're kind of killing off one stretch of the river. And whatever the State's say, you know, they come up with this solution or this proposal after they heard about my proposal, you know. That's the way they've been dealing with the issue all the time, you know, kind of counter-acting. But I got a lot of support from a lot of people I talked to on this and I didn't just dream this up overnight.

I've been thinking about it for maybe 20 years, you know, to do something about kind of conserving the moose for subsistence. Because every year it's getting harder and harder for locals to get a moose, you know. They have to go farther or spend more time out in the woods and, you know, it's just getting harder for people and the times are not getting any easier either, so anybody come up with a better solution I'd like to hear it, you know. Thanks

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes?

MS. VANDERPOOL: I would just like to make a comment. I kind of see where Harold's coming from because upriver in the Red Devil, Sleepmute, Kuskokwim, Upper Kuskokwim Holitna area we kind of have the same problem. It's all under State Fish & Game though, but you know, we see a lot of waste and we see a lot of meat coming into the villages and the big game hunters are trying to give it away to the people and it's all sour and everything and nobody will take it, so they just leave it.

And then, we see a lot on the river there done like that, the same. There was a real bad situation that happened at

Sleetmute trying to control the hunters coming from downriver up into the Holitna area and they lowered it trying to compromise with everybody, so they lowered it to a 40 horsepower limit and so far that's been going pretty good, you know. Besides that you have to think about all the fish and stuff, too, you know, where they spawn, too, not only, you know, just where the hunters are going to go with their big fancy boats and all.

And that got kind of all turned around so now they're in all kinds of legal hassle and stuff like that, you know, but when it comes down to the subsistence part and when our people need that meat, I mean there's -- you have to do what you have to do, you can't please everybody. You have to go for your village first or the wants of your people, the subsistence users.

A few years ago we had an incident before they did the 40 horsepower limit upriver, it was a really warm fall and there was a lot of moose hunters from downriver, none of the local people went out and went hunting because it was too warm to keep all their meat, so after moose season was closed they went up and shot their meat so they could take care of all. And Fish & Game did their best and they did come up and he gave everybody tickets, you know, and he wrote them fines and stuff like that but they didn't care 'cause that was for their use. But me myself personally I really support Harold's proposal and for our region.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Harold, what about the issue of high water mark where actually most of the beach would be open anyhow, how

MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, if you use common sense. The high water mark is usually where the trees start going, you know, on a sand bar or on a mountain. I don't think that's a problem. I think the State is just using that as some kind of excuse to block this proposal, you know, that's their tactics and that's always been their tactics.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: Is the high water mark been further defined since our last -- is there a real definitive

MR. ELEY: There's still some deficiencies between -- or differences between what the State and the Federal government. We recognize it, my understanding is from Bill Knauer. Bill probably would be the better person to tell you, but within the channel high water, the high water is to where it would be within the channel. The State and particularly the people out in our area with the State recognize grass lakes and all these other things as ordinary high, so it gets to be real nebulous from their standpoint.

Certainly the Fish & Wildlife Protection officers wouldn't be enforcing this, they wouldn't want any part of it, because they would contend that it would be too nebulous an issue. And, you know, people could still camp, for example, in the refuge and hunt below ordinary high water. So it gets to be a real difficult thing to enforce.

You know, I understand where Harold's coming from and I have some of the same concerns. There are plenty of hunters coming out there, there's no question about it, but we can't keep them off navigable water and that's where, at least, from the analysis we have from the non-local hunters that's where most of the people that are traversing this area are taking moose. They're not going a half a mile off back into the brush to hunt. They are hunting are they're traversing up to Three-Day Slough.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there a way of addressing the issue, Harold, of the -- they're hanging meat up when they go up because obviously they don't want to haul that moose upriver and then

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: back down again. I'm wondering

if that approach would cut down on that harvest, incidental harvest because unless they turn around right there and take that moose they're probably going on up to hunt up there.

MR. ELEY: Generally large parties of people, maybe four guys, you know, if four of us were going up there and I shot my moose first off the other three people that after you've funded a big trip up there are probably not going to want to turn around and go home.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So what if they were required to not leave that moose that it has to be in their camp or they have to take it with them or something, then they're likely to pass those up; would that be another approach or

MR. HUNTINGTON: I doubt if you'll see anybody want to haul a moose up (indiscernible - interrupted)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right, but wouldn't they pass it up then if they had to do that?

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's what this proposal is trying to do.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. That might be another approach at some point to do something about how long you can leave meat hanging unattended.

MR. ELEY: Yeah, but some local people also hang meat, not as much as on the Koyukuk but certainly on the Nowitna River, there's a lot of meat that's hung. People come up in small boats in fairly large parties and they leave the meat and run back and forth three and four times, so

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

MR. ELEY: you know, it becomes sort of problematic as you're ending up causing more problems for local people than you are for non-local people who generally do have bigger boats.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, we've used that same practice

before

MR. ELEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: on the Upper Kuskokwim, too.
If we're going on a trip up river, you know, you

MR. ELEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: never hauled the meat up river,
you had to come back (ph).

MR. ELEY: Two other issues that are tangentially related to this. One is I met with the Loudon Village Council and we discussed a motor limitation. And people sort of got fired up for the idea of maybe a 60 horse limitation, you couldn't have anything greater than 60 horses until we pointed out that well, most of the people in Galena have engines that are bigger than 60 horsepower. There are a few that are less than, but, you know, the bulk of the boats have 100 to 150 horsepower engines. So again, you'd be restricting local people.

In addition, there's a group of us that have gotten together now, representatives from Huslia, Koyukuk, Nowitna -- Koyukuk, Nulato, Kaltag and Galena and are talking about moose issues including the Federal government, Fish & Wildlife Service and the State and TCC and we've met once just recently in Galena and this was, again, one of the issues that came up and we talked about this proposal as well as the State proposal. And the difficulties of limiting people, you know. It'd be nice if we could just make people go to Three-Day Slough and not hunt on the way up, that would solve the problem. But there's no way to easily do that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: Ray, before we go further with discussions I need to advise you on two things. One, be aware that the audience of your recommendations is the Board. And the Board can only reject your recommendation if it's not supported by

substantial evidence or violates recognized principles of fish and wildlife conservation and if it would be detrimental to subsistence use.

The other thing I need to point out, I'm just pointing it out so you're aware of that, is that Section 815 of ANILCA, any time that you're looking at restricting non-subsistence use on Federal public lands it has to be based on conservation concern for healthy populations of fish and wildlife, so there has to be a conservation concern before you restrict non-subsistence uses. And I think I got that right. If I got it wrong someone will correct me, but I needed to advise you of that and the three criteria for a Board to reject your recommendation.

MR. ELEY: And one other issue, too, one of the concerns expressed by Pollock and others has been the wanton waste and this proposal doesn't really address wanton waste problem.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Pollock?

MR. SIMON: One more comment. What most of us subsistence hunters in the village we do it, just private owner, two peoples in a boat. If we kill a moose today we would probably be back in the village next day and take care of our meat. It is different with the sport hunters or other urban hunters. They come a long way so there might be three or four in the boat, so if they get a moose then they have to wait until everybody, the other parties in the boat get a moose and it might be a week or so. And during that time the moose meat might spoil or something.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have one other comment. Yeah, this proposal is -- that might -- the way I look at it is it's a conservation measure, you know, it's trying to keep the moose, you know, whatever's left along that stretch of river, you know, maintained at least so they don't get completely wiped out because if it continues like this, you know, it's probably one of the deadest stretches of river in Alaska right now to tell

you the truth because there's so much traffic going through it. So it's mainly a conservation measure. It has nothing to do with, you know, whatever it is is, (ph) you know, second nature but according to ANILCA, you know, this is a conservation measure.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Angela?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: My comment is they have the same problem we did in the village of Shageluk and the Grayling region. They have a lot of people coming in and taking moose and leaving moose like they do up there, they hang it on the beach and then they leave it or they'll knock down a cow and leave it there because it's not a bull because they know Fish & Game is going to check when they leave the Paimiut station. Or they'll go back in the woods and they'll knock down or cow or a bull and then they'll say, oh, too much work to bring it back. We'll get another one. We'll get another one that's along the river so we won't have to pack it out. So we see a lot of waste in our area because of a lot of hunters coming in that they're just there, I mean they're there to get meat. And like upriver, there's four or five and if they don't -- they all have to have a moose, we see boats going downriver with four or five moose heads in there and here we're sitting on the bank with no moose in our boat, we're still looking but they're getting all the moose and we're getting nothing. So I can really understand what Harold is talking about wanting to close that area. And we don't -- not only do we have those people, we have people flying in off the main jet out of Aniak, come right into our village and hunting in places that we would normally be camping that this guide from Holy Cross, he takes them out and gets them their moose and he says he's bringing them out fishing and when I go fishing I only bring 22. And when they go fishing they bring 30.30 and 30.06 and 7mm, for what? There's nothing out there? You might shoot a duck or two, but not when you're fishing. You don't go shooting a duck with a 30.06, so we know he's bringing out big game hunters, but he says he's fishing. And he's the same person that has 15 heads in his yard, big moose horns. And it's obvious those hunters would take all is the big moose horn and no meat. I can understand what Harold is talking about that he'd like to close this area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game. I'm not hearing too well much of what's being said, but I think for the record I hear that the Department of Fish & Game is somehow being blamed for not enforcing regulations against wanton waste and illegal killing. And I would like to point out that we have no law enforcement authority. That is all in the hands of the Fish & Wildlife Enforcement Division in the Department of Public Safety.

And if there are problems such as I've heard described going on in that area they should certainly be brought in to try to control that. There is a regulation that requires hunters to get the meat out to be in good condition someplace before they bring out any antlers. And, of course, there is the law against wanton waste. And if that's not all being enforced then the people in that area should be making a very concerted effort to get to the right people either their legislators or whoever to get the law enforcement pressure in that area that seems to be needed. But, again, the Fish & Game Department does not have law enforcement authority. Our concern is with the biology of the animals and not so much with the allocation. And consequently, the regulations that we spend most of our time addressing have to do with the health and numbers and reproduction and all of the wildlife stock. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, John. Yeah. It's not so much a problem of outright violation because we see the same thing in our area, but it's a matter of timing because they will hang the meat on there or they do salvage the meat and pack it out, but when they're on a long hunt there's no way they're going to be able to get it out of the field in time for it to be in good shape because of the length of time.

I know this year, for instance, the hunters from way down river, Bethel or wherever down there that were hunting in the upper Kuskokwim because it was a warm fall they couldn't stay too long. They're having problems because they had moose hanging in their camp there, but you know, after four or five

days if they don't try to get that moose home it's going to spoil. And since they were after meat they took off and left. And they weren't even there the last few days of the season. But I think -- so part of it is -- and you can't cite them on that. If they've brought the meat in and so on and even if they're hauling it in the boat and leave it in the boat for five days you can't cite them for waste if they it recovered and brought it in. So it's a difficult one to enforce, but it's a real problem.

MR. MORRISON: I might add a footnote to this. And that is on the Mulchatna River area there got to be quite a problem with hunters floating. They would fly in from Anchorage and they'd be dropped off in the upper Nushagak and Mulchatna River drainages in Unit 17 and there got to be a lot of this abandonment of meat. The excuse was the bears got it or something, you know. And the local people there got together with the area biologist and the law enforcement person and they got several people in boats, local residents in their own boats patrolling up and down looking for these kind of situations and letting the law enforcement guy know where they were finding problems and they cited and fined quite a few people that were not making proper preparations to handle that meat correctly. These people were mostly in rafts that they would float and it was implied by the law Enforcement Department -- Division that if they're going to take on that responsibility of hunting down there it's also their responsibility to make proper aircraft arrangements to come in there and pick up that meat as fast as they get it and take it out to where it can be properly taken care of. And they made several cases down there on that. It put a stop to a lot of it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions about the proposal then? Where are we at? Are we ready for a motion?

Okay. If this passes, if we adopt it, it would close the area for what, the first 40 miles? I'm trying to think what the effect is.

MR. ELEY: No, it's about 40 miles to -- it's about a 49 mile stretch and it starts about 40 miles up the river.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. ELEY: So it's not the lower part of the river. It's not the mouth of the river, the lower 40 miles. It starts 40 miles up the river. Most of the lower is corporation land anyway, so it wouldn't affect.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. And it would, in effect, close it within a half a mile of the river except for everything below the high water mark?

MR. ELEY: Below the ordinary high water mark.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And

MR. ELEY: So someone could camp on the bank of the river. They could camp on the bank of the river and then walk back in a half mile and hunt and bring it back out to the river which would look to a lot of people like they were hunting within a half mile, so I mean it's real difficult.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And it would be in effect -- I trying to think what the effect would be because there is a State season and bag limit there, too. How would it be -- would it be enforceable. I mean it's a Federal -- it applies to Federal subsistence hunting, but how -- is it because it's in a refuge we can close it. I'm not sure. Because it's in a refuge we're asking the federal

MR. ELEY: It's Federal public land.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Federal public land. Yeah. So we're asking them to impose that rule, so then it would apply to the Federal land within that area.

MR. ELEY: Uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Which would be above the high water mark. Okay. And it would be up to the individual hunters to decide whether or not they were above or below the high water

mark, et cetera?

MR. ELEY: That's right. And there's some allotments in there and, you know, it's a real land management sort of mixture in there and so it's going to be up to the person to recognize whether they're on Federal public land, if they're in a half mile or below ordinary high water.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But if it was adopted then it really wouldn't be denying them opportunity except for that area because it's better hunting above anyhow. They've got another place to go that has better hunting and it might discourage some. I mean there's going to be an enforcement problem, but it would discourage some for not bothering with it. They'd just go right on through which is what is wanted by this.

MR. ELEY: Yeah, it'll discourage some. But it's, I don't think, a lot.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. ELEY: Most people that hunt the rivers there, a lot of them that go up the Koyukuk have hunted a long time up there so they know what the seasons are. They know where Federal land is and where it's not. They know what's going on. They know where the ordinary high water is, is the mark. They're not going to think that that section of the river itself is closed. I mean they may be concerned with what if I shoot a moose on the riverbank and it runs up on the -- up above ordinary high water and dies, you know, is the game warden going to give me a citation or what, you know, for this. And you know, that would be one of those enforcement issues. It'd be real difficult.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do we have a motion concerning the proposal or any questions? Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I move that we accept the proposal 44.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there a second?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Second by Gail. Move to adopt. Is there any further discussion of the motion? All those in favor? Go ahead, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I was reading the ANILCA law and unless the game population is in trouble, the limitation for subsistence only is not allowed. I'm a little bit uneasy with that, with the legal language of the ANILCA law. But because we don't know what the State Game Board is going to do and whether they're -- they're very pro sport hunting, I'm going to go along, I'm going to vote for this proposal, but I'm saying I'm a little bit unsure. The law says that unless there's a problem with the game population you can't limit it for subsistence, 815. But I'll vote for this proposal at this time. The State may pass their proposal and maybe that'll work fine and -- but maybe they won't, so we can't take a chance on the State's Game Board. That's just what I wanted to say about that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'm kind of in the same situation. I have concerns about enforcement and then there may not be much enforcement, but I will vote for it, too. I think it may discourage some that don't want to try it to go on by which is the intent of it is to get people to pass that area up.

MR. REAKOFF: I think Harold has given people opportunity to -- if they want to walk off the river and go kill a moose then a half a mile is a big pack, but a lot of people will do that, you know. He's giving people opportunity to hunt relatively close. I think Harold's been fairly fair about that part of it in limiting it to the area where people mostly hunt, so that's all I have to say about that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other comments and motion?

MR. SIMON: Just a few more comments. It is clear that (indiscernible) Three-Day Slough down the Koyukuk River. I'm pretty sure there's plenty of moose for everybody, but what the local people don't like is the wanton waste. You know, if you get a moose in September that's enough meat for a table for probably half the winter until winter season or it depends on

how big the family is. And if we can discourage the sport hunters or urban hunters a little bit and save the moose for the locals I would -- that's what we're trying to do, you know, if we can only discourage some of them, (indiscernible) support this proposal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand?

Yes votes for all seven members. Motion carried.

Next proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We've already addressed Proposal 45 and 46. We're now up to Proposal 47.

Proposal 47 is dealing with Unit 24 moose. It would change the dates of the fall and winter moose seasons for Unit 24, that portion of the Alatna River Drainage within gates of the Arctic National Park from August 25th through September 25th to August 25th through December 31st. And for March 1 through the 10th to March 1 through the 31st respectively.

The proposal was submitted by Jim Schwarber. And let me grab the public comments.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Wait a minute, are you looking at 45? Which one are you looking at?

MR. MATHEWS: No, I'm looking at 47. We dealt with 45 and 46 yesterday. 45, 46 was the

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. Right. Right. Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: 21(D)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Right.

MR. MATHEWS: The comments we received to date and John Morrison may want to elaborate. Alaska Department of Fish & game support only if modified this proposal. As presently

proposed this regulation would increase the moose season for all residents of Allakaket, Bettles and there's not enough moose in the areas to support that much increased harvest. The most justifiable proposal would be to modify the John River season. The Department recommends that the proposal be amended to provide Unit 24 moose, those portions of the John River August 1 through December 1 -- there's a typo error here, so it'd be Unit 24 moose, those portions of the John River and the Alatna River drainages within Gates of the Arctic, the season of August 1st through December 31st, March 1st through the 31st, one moose. And then I need to make sure before you get into discussion to give you the corrected version of that proposal in your analysis book is the air proposal, so make sure I get the corrected one.

The Koyukuk River local Fish & Game Advisory Committee opposes this proposal. The March season would be too long and there are not enough moose to support the longer season. The committee likes the current five day antlerless season in September and the 10 day season in March. And Pollock and Jack are members of that committee and they may want to elaborate on that.

The North Slope Regional Advisory Committee met on this proposal. They support the proposal with the modification. Their modification is to -- let's see, have the proposal read those portions of the John River and the Alatna River Drainages within Gates of the Arctic National Park one moose August 1 through December 31st and March 1 through the 31st. So with that I'll hand you, if I can find it quick enough, the corrected version of Proposal 47. The one in front of you left out that the proposer wanted it for park service lands within Unit 24 along the Alatna River. So it'll take me a second to find the corrected proposal. I'll take me longer than that. You may want to listen to the analysis but the main change is the fact that the proposal is just the section. I could show you an overhead what we'll talking about and then I'll find the handout.

Okay. This section up here and then I'll find the actual proposal. It's just asking for the lands of Nowitnas in the Gates of the Arctic National Park, that's signified by these

diagonal lines, so I'll find the proposal and give you the corrected version.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Could we have the analysis then?

MR. HUNTER: Mr. Chairman, I'm Paul Hunter with the National Park Service Anchorage office. Normally our Park subsistence manager, Steve Ulvi would present the proposal. He had a schedule conflict with the rescheduled meeting this week and so he couldn't be here. Also Conrad would -- Guenther, Fish & Wildlife Service assisted him in preparing the analysis. And, of course, Conrad is not here as well, so I'm filling in for both of those fellas and I'll do as -- I'm filling in for Steve, and of course, We have other folks here who can comment for Conrad on other issues.

The first thing that's important to understand on this particular proposal is there's very limited biological information on this moose population in the upper Alatna River. It's well within the park and the area is -- there's no State hunting in the area. And it's limited to residents on communities for Gates of the Arctic National Park within Unit 24 which includes Anaktuvuk Pass, Wiseman, Bettles and Evansville, Alatna, Allakaket and Hughes. So there's a fairly limited group of eligible subsistence hunters that can qualify for this season on the Alatna.

The moose population in that area is based on the limited information that is available is stable at low to moderate densities for the population. There's fairly poor access to the area in the fall so a longer season for the fall -- well, let me back up. The proposal is asking to extend the fall season by 118 days from September -- it currently ends on September 25th. The proposal would extend it until December 31st. That's an extension of 118 days. It also asks to extend the season in March for an additional 21 days to cover the entire month of March.

Regarding the fall season, the extension in the fall, there's fairly poor access up to the upper reaches of the Alatna River in the fall. And so the longer fall season probably

wouldn't increase the harvest very much there. I would defer on that question to Pollock and Jack. They could probably comment more on what an extended season might -- how much additional pressure it might result in from the eligible subsistence users from their communities. But, the guess -- the best guess that we have at this point is that it probably wouldn't increase it greatly because of the difficult access there in the fall. However, for the March season because of snow cover and improved access with snow machines there's a potential for more hunting pressure during an extended season in March. But again, I would defer to Pollock and Jack to really give the expert opinion on whether or not that would be likely that it would occur.

The proposal is based on there being longer -- first of all, that the existing season is not long enough for -- to get a moose for the -- it's Jim Schwarber is the one who actually made this proposal and he is saying that he is -- the existing season isn't giving them enough time to get a moose. And then also in comparison to the seasons adjacent to the Alatna River Drainage that the season is shorter and that that doesn't seem to make sense.

I would just point out in that regard for the seasons, while this overlay does not clearly show it, the area directly north of the cross-hatched area is in Unit 26. And that area is in the Gates of the Arctic National Park as well. And it is only open -- while it has a longer season it is only open to residents of Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuiqsut. So there's a very, very restricted group of people who can hunt in that area. To the west in Unit 23 there's a similar -- the season is longer as well, but there's a similar restriction in that only subsistence users from Ambler, Kobuk and Shungnak can hunt in that area, so that may explain somewhat why the season is longer, although I'm just guessing at this point, but it does illustrate that while the seasons surrounding the upper Alatna Drainage are longer, there's a very limited group of people who can hunt there because it is in the park and it is limited to subsistence users in the residents own communities for the park who are in different game management units in terms of the c&t.

That certainly couldn't change and Jack and Pollock

could address that if there's any likely changes in the customary and traditional use determinations for the Gates of the Arctic National Park area. There certainly has been some discussion about opening up the Gates of the Arctic National Park to all of the residents own communities for the park regardless of which GMU they happen to fall in. But as of right now it's broken into the three areas because there are three different game management units that cover the park.

The recommendation or the final analysis is that the fall season doesn't -- probably will not cause significant additional hunting pressure up in the upper Alatna; however, the extension of the spring season has a high potential for increasing the harvest. And that's of concern.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: The spring will because of snow machine access?

MR. HUNTER: Yes. Access from down river from the communities that are residents own communities for the park. But again, there I would defer to Pollock especially being from down river there on whether or not -- what kind of spring hunting pressure there might be up there if it were extended or how much pressure there is even now with the 10 day season.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions or comments from Pollock or Jack are closest, I guess.

MR. SIMON: Go ahead, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: As this is all park land it has a real limited eligibility and access restrictions. I do agree with the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee that extending the March season to the end of March is too long of an extension of the spring season, but I feel that the modified proposal of August 25th to December 31 and then a March 1st to March 10th season, which there's a March 10th season in the other drainages in the North Fork Drainage and the other drainages we have a 10 day moose season already and that would align with the current

seasons in the rest of the other park drainages. So I would support this proposal with a modification of March 1 to March 10th for the end of the season.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions?

MR. SIMON: I would agree with Jack on the modification.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions by any of the members for the analysis or information or

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Harold.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Is there a lot of moose in the area we're talking about? I mean is there any problem with shortage or

Well, in that case I don't see any justification simply to open it one whole month, you know. I think 10 days is sufficient to

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: In March.

MR. HUNTINGTON: get moose. Yeah. In March. That's all.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other questions or information? Then do we have an actual motion concerning this?

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt the proposal 47

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do you want to amend it?

MR. REAKOFF: with an amendment to the March season being March 1 to March 10th.

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Moved by Jack, seconded by Pollock, that we amend and adopt. Discussions?

MR. MATHEWS: Is there a second on that?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Pollock. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand?

Motion carried. It's adopted as amended. That's seven yes votes for all members.

Oh, great, okay. Let's take a break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Next proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: The next proposal, Mr. Chairman, is Proposal 32. It has to do with caribou in Unit 17(A). You'll find it on page 46 of your tan covered book. It provides subsistence caribou hunting opportunities on a seasonal basis in Unit 17(A) west of the Togiak River, Togiak Lake, someone's going to have to help with me with that -- Ed are you going to do 32 and 33 together.

MR. FISHER: Yeah, 32 and 33 can be handled together.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Can you give me a pronunciation of the river?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Izavieknik or something.

MR. MATHEWS: Whatever.

MR. FISHER: Izavieknik River.

MR. MATHEWS: Izavieknik River. Upper Togiak Lake and south to Cape Ne- --

MR. FISHER: Newenham.

MR. MATHEWS: Newenham. The proposed season would be August 15th through April 15 for a two caribou harvest limit. Mr. Chairman, the public comments on that, it'll take me a second to find. Okay. Proposal 32 Alaska Department of Fish & Game opposes the proposal. Current State regulation allows an open season in the protected area when more than 10,000 caribou are present. This number was chosen to protect the nearby Kilbuck caribou herd and allow the Mulchatna herd to become established in the area before a hunting season is established. The reason for proposing the change is to allow harvest along the Togiak River. Most of the land along the river is privately owned, thereby, subject to State regulations. This proposal would not open those lands to caribou hunting.

The Kwethluk Joint Group supports the proposal. The Yukon/Kuskokwim Regional Advisory Committee took action on this and their action was to take no action.

Let me look at Proposal 33. We'll do these jointly. I believe the same public comments apply because I just have copies of the Kwethluk Joint Group. So with that unless I've missed something those are the public comments.

The reason these two proposals are before you are because of the customary and traditional use determination which we probably will need to bring out right in the beginning. And, Dave, are you bringing that out? Okay. I can brief you on that or maybe George will be doing that. I'm not sure.

Let me grab a regs book if someone has one and I can give you that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Did I understand you right that our counterpart Yukon/Kuskokwim took no action on this?

MR. MATHEWS: Correct. They took no action on 32. Dave can probably tell you what they did on 33.

MR. FISHER: The Yukon Council took no action on 32 and

then they adopted 33 with a minor modification. And that modification was to shorten the season up on the spring end of this season.

MR. MATHEWS: The customary and traditional use determination for 17(A), (B) and (C) is rural residents of Unit 9(B) and 17 and residents of Lime Village and Stony River. That's why these two proposals are before you.

And with that we'll, if it's agreeable, go to the analysis.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Proceed with the analysis.

MR. FISHER: Yeah. Basically 32 and 33 are pretty simple. 32 would allow for a caribou season in 17(A) west of the Togiak River regardless of how many caribou are in that area.

33 would allow for a season, same area, when enough animals are present to warrant a season. And by that I mean when enough animals from the Mulchatna herd and animals from the Kilbuck herd are in the area.

And the reason they've done that is to allow a proper mix between the Mulchatna herd and the Kilbuck herd to prevent an over-harvest of that Kilbuck herd. As you know it's a smaller herd and it just recently opened up some caribou seasons on it, so that's the primary reason for that. Another -- there is currently an existing season and that season came into effect through a special action. And that special action expires this coming April and this Proposal 33 is basically a continuation of that special action. 33 would align both the Federal season and the State season. And currently we have a good working relationship there in the Dillingham area with the refuge people and the counterpart, Fish & Game biologist, and those people would get together and determine when a season would need to be opened.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What was the modified one on that 33, August 1 to 15, is that the modified? Or you said there were

.....

MR. FISHER: Well, yes, the modification recommended by the Yukon/Delta Council was to shorten this season from April 15 to March 31st. And the primary concern was seasons in adjacent Unit 18 and also there was some concern about hunting those -- essentially hunting the pregnant females there during the latter part of this season.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. FISHER: As you know, the Mulchatna herd has expanded greatly over the last 10 - 12 years and has come down into 18 and in 1994, early '95 some of those animals mixed with the Kilbuck herd and did come over into 17(A). So this would provide for a season when enough animals are present.

And the staff recommendation was to take no action on 32 and adopt 33.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: In the modified form or in the full version?

MR. FISHER: Full version.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Full version 1 to 15. Okay.

(Off record comments)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions. Is this all the analysis then?

MR. FISHER: That's basically all I have unless you have some questions. I'll be happy to

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions.

MR. FISHER: As you've probably already detected I'm a little bit up in tune with what's going on in this area rather than the other areas, so I feel a little bit more at home here with these two proposals.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Can you comment on that shortening? I guess that's the only difference in terms of action that's already been taken. Our counterpart is recommending to the Federal Board the shortened version and you're saying the analysis supports the 1 to 15. Comment on the differences again.

MR. FISHER: Well, actually the differences would primarily be the not aligning with the State season, however, when a season is set by the locals they probably could really any season they wanted within the parameter that would establish the August 1st to April 15th they could set a season probably within that, a 10 day season or a 20 day season.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. So that would be just a window of opportunity then, the 1 to 15

MR. FISHER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: and then if there's enough animals at that time they would determine how long.

MR. FISHER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. FISHER: The information, biological information in the past shows that those animals have moved into that area but they aren't there for very long. And this year, '96, late '95, early '96 there was probably I'm going to estimate somewhere between 1,500 and maybe 3,000 animals that were actually in 17(A) west of the Togiak River. My figures may not be exact but they're pretty close. And those animals really didn't stay in that area very long. The Mulchatna herd didn't do what it did in '94 and '95. It used different areas and there weren't as many Kilbuck animals down this year, so there was no season this year.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any questions? Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: I see that the people from Lime Village and Stony River, their own special season, they can't kill cows between April 1 and August 9th, is that one of the reasons why the other council wanted to reduce it to March 31?

MR. FISHER: Yeah, I believe they wanted to line up with those. The feelings were the same.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think that would be -- could be addressed locally by when they do an opening. That's why I asked that question. It seems this was just created when the window of opportunity wouldn't open the whole thing (ph). Questions about 33? Do we have a motion?

I think it's important that we take some action because we do have -- because of some of villages in our area alignment. So under that if we didn't act then the Board would -- it would be hard to prevent or foresee (ph). Yes, Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I had a question. Would it put any more restriction on Lime Village or Stony River?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What would be the impact on Lime Village in terms of their season? Would it affect them one way or the other?

MR. FISHER: No, it shouldn't as long as they're still eligible in that area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. It's outside the area they're hunting actually, isn't it? I mean physically is it outside the area

MR. FISHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: that they get to? Yeah. So what's your wishes?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt Proposal 33.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Jack moves to adopt. Is there a second?

MR. SIMON: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Second by Pollock. Any discussion of that motion?

All those in favor signify by raising your right hand?

Again, yes votes for all members present. Motion carried.

MR. MATHEWS: The next is Proposal 32 then.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: No action. We adopted 33. I don't think we -- do they need us to reject that? Is that what the Board is looking for, they want a statement on each one? Does anyone wish to comment on that?

MR. FISHER: Maybe for Vince (ph). I think a statement would be probably appropriate.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What, that we took no action?

MR. FISHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. No action on 32 then.

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings us up to Proposal 40 which is in your brown covered book starting on page 53. It deals with black bear in Unit 18, which is a customary and traditional use determination proposal. It requests that residents of Unit 18 be determined eligible for customary and

traditional uses of black bear in Unit 18.

The reason this is before you is because of possible use of Western Interior residents of hunting black bear in Unit 18.

Public comments -- you guys are catching me short on each of these proposals. The Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Committee adopted the preliminary conclusion which is in your proposal analysis which is that rural residents of Unit 18, Lower Kalsag, Upper Kalsag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Unit 19(A) residents living down stream of the Holokuk River, Holy Cross, St. Michaels, Stebbins, Twin Hills and Togiak have a positive c&t determination for black bear in Unit 18.

The other public comment was from Kwethluk Joint Group which supported the proposal.

And that's all the public comments that I know of, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And this comes before us because of residents in Aniak and that area that we have jurisdiction over. This is Unit 18. The reason it comes to us is because of some communities in our area have customary -- you know,

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, George can address that.

MR. SHERROD: I can address that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: George, any comments?

MR. SHERROD: Thank you. Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'll try to walk you through this.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SHERROD: As identified in the proposal itself it says that there'll be no impact on the population and there will be no impact currently on subsistence. And that's because we currently have a no determination in Unit 18. That means any

subsistence user can from -- throughout the state can go to Unit 18 if they so desire to take black bear. The State and Federal seasons are the same basically, bear 365 days a year, three bear harvest limit. So what this proposal is asking is that you go from a situation in which all subsistence users and all sports users can harvest black bear in Unit 18 to only residents of Unit 18 being able to harvest black bear in Unit 18.

Now, residents, other subsistence users -- because it says there's no impact, other subsistence users from adjoining areas can still go there, in essence, and harvest under State regulations. There's no priority or special benefit from having a recognition for black bear in Unit 18.

In the analysis, again, when we looked at the question of moose on -- by the -- when we looked at the question of the use of moose by residents of Unit 18, we had harvest ticket data and map data. In this case there are no harvest ticket data available for black bear. We do have information from the Division of Subsistence and based on an analysis of that, and again, we're going back to the question of where because, I think, we all intuitively accept the fact that probably rural residents of Unit 18 are subsistence villages, specifically given the data we have.

We are confronted, however, with the question of just how similar these communities are when we deal with the c&t that is as inclusive as this. An example of that might be, if you look on page 58, 59 and 60, at the top line you'll see this is black bear harvest for Aniak. And we have recorded here August through October. On the following page about half way down there's fish and then there's land mammals, we have black bear. And this is for the village of Kwethluk, we have April through the middle of November. Am I going too fast?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You know, a little bit.

MR. SHERROD: Okay. It's the top line

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I see now. I see, uh-huh.

MR. SHERROD: Okay. If you flip the page over and this is for Russian Mission and black bear is after fish again and there's four groups down there, mammals, and you'll see that we've got from the beginning of March basically through the middle of December. So the current data shows that -- would suggest that all these communities are, in fact, probably customary and traditional users of black bear. That when you deal with an area this large and inclusive you're going to have local variation so that I feel it's something problematic in some instances dealing with areas this big collectively.

Also in the analysis, and again, this is based solely on land use mapping done by the Division of Subsistence since we don't have harvest statistics. Michael Coffing who did the analysis did determine that there was use by residents of communities, particularly in this instance, 21(E) which is one of the areas in your concern and 19(A). Residents from some of those communities actually had gone to the Delta to harvest moose and that's why in the preliminary conclusion and the modification that those villages were included.

I think that what this body has to decide is are we potentially missing other communities from your area that should have been in that conclusion.

Now, again, we have to remember that this does not at this point in time affect the opportunity to hunt down there. The only way that this would have a negative impact on subsistence would be if there were to be a more liberal season in Unit 18 and residents from out of that unit could not participate in that liberalization or that the Board adopt a restriction non-subsistence hunters in Unit 18. And again, those individuals would be precluded. However, at this time it would have no effect and because this is an annual process it would be possible for any community that is being left out because we didn't have the data to appeal this decision and have it brought before this body next year.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. So the finding right now is just that the communities listed in there have this customary and traditional?

MR. SHERROD: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And the additional ones in our area if in the future their opportunity to harvest is affected they could come in and argue that they also had customary and traditional and they have a chance to do that annually?

MR. SHERROD: Well, the c&t can be brought annually.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. SHERROD: We're hoping that it doesn't because obviously we

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. SHERROD: couldn't deal with all of them at this point in time, but yes, it would be possible and say that the problem here is that our data base is limited to those communities that were either fortunate or to have been studied by the Division of Subsistence or one might say subject to their studies, whatever, but those are the communities that are able to demonstrate, the non Unit 18 communities are able to demonstrate use.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And why is it that they're asking for this finding at this time since there is a year round season or three bear bag limit and so on, it's just

MR. SHERROD: I think that within the proposal itself there's a comment there if you flip back to the proposal. There is a statement about -- what is it, the proposal change on subsistence users and the last clause, there will help ensure the area subsistence users are provided with a priority in times of resource shortage.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SHERROD: Again, though, we have -- before we could -- there is currently the mechanism to restrict or preclude non-

subsistence activities prior to restricting or precluding other subsistence users which in effect this determination would potentially do.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: I was at the meeting in Bethel in the fall when this proposal was offered by the Yukon Delta Council. And I'd just add one additional point to George's comments.

The Yukon Delta Council looked at all of the backlog proposals, proposals on c&t submitted between 1992 roughly and '95 and wanted to basically take action on all of those, in turn, systematically go through the c&t questions in their region. So the moose proposals were dealt with as you see in this season, this year as well. And the next species of interest to them was then black bear. So they took the view that a no determination meant there had been no consideration, no deliberation by the board, a question mark, so to speak, sitting out there and they wanted to alleviate the question marks or eliminate the question marks on c&t determinations in the region. So I think that's -- it wasn't done on a practical basis of a burning crisis, lack of opportunity to harvest black bear. It was done on the basis of getting a comprehensive c&t determination to recognize subsistence uses throughout the unit.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, Taylor. Questions? Do you have comments? Okay.

MR. DENTON: My comments are pretty brief. I'm Jeff Denton from BLM. And BLM has some lands in Unit 18. Probably other than the Andraefsky Drainage which is on the refuge, the other black bear habitat basically in Unit 18 is mostly BLM of which -- none of which is indicated as a hunting area for black bear by the figure 4. Primarily the areas outlined there are brown bear areas that basically is not black bear habitat. It's all open country. The timbered black bear habitats aren't even recognized as black bear hunting areas in Unit 18. So that's

just some information. I'm a little bit confused as to why there's such an emphasis on black bear hunting in Unit 18. It's not a large producer of black bears. Black bear habitat is fairly limited and by the map here it's not even recognized as bear hunting areas. So just I'm a little confused, I guess, and maybe someone can clarify that for a me a little bit.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I think from what I heard it's just asking -- it's answering a question. There's no deterrent there and the people are saying that when black bear are available they've customarily and traditionally hunted them. And so they're saying that they should have a c&t finding where they're available in that area basically to just answer the question instead of no determination. I don't thin they're saying that there's a problem or that -- that's what I was hearing from Taylor is that basically

MR. BRELSFORD: That's my understanding.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: they wanted to answer the question. They're saying when they're available we customarily and traditionally hunted them. And we want that recognized.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, I would suspect the black bears that are killed are incidentally killed while people are pursuing moose or other animals. There's hardly enough black bear to warrant strictly black bear hunting in that area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other comments in terms of -- any questions on the part of people here?

MR. SIMON: I move to adopt Proposal 40.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Pollock moves to adopt 40. Is there a second to that? The motion dies for lack of second. What is your wishes? Do you want to make no action?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I would like to hear from Angela on or Gale about use down drivers into the 18. Do you feel that there's not enough current knowledge right now or

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: (Indiscernible) brown bear in the bush camps, not black bear down there. As far up as Johnny Paul's fish camp there's brown bear. And then up this way is where black bears are, up the Innoko River. Then back in the running (ph) sloughs and the side sloughs, that's where you see the black bears.

MR. REAKOFF: So up river people don't hunt down there normally?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Uh-hum. They know where the bears are up. They're not down there,

MR. REAKOFF: But the proposal

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: (indiscernible - simultaneous speech) brown bear.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: the proposal is for the people who live in that unit. If they see a black bear they hunt a black bear, that's the proposal is that they would hunt those black bears down in Unit 18.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Let the people in Unit 18 vote on it.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Can I speak?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Up in the Red Devil, I know that -- or Red Devil, Georgetown, and Crooked Creek, especially in the Stony River area people don't go, you know, way down to Unit 18 to hunt black bear. They just do it right up there. And as far as I know from the Aniak Kalskag area it's just done right there in that area. I tend to agree with BLM when they say they're in this area there is hardly any black bear.

I was born and raised in Bethel and I've never seen a black bear down in that unit, you know. So I just don't see how they could have their customary and traditional use for black bear there. I mean I guess if they're going to see a black bear there they're going to shoot it in their country there, but I just don't understand it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince, could you clarify, do we need to take action on this finding? Can the Federal Board act without our action since it's on Unit 18?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure. They could take action without your

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think people are reluctant to make and pass action on 18 when it doesn't affect us. This proposal basically does not affect us. It's kind of a reverse of that other one, maybe, on the moose where we don't want to make statements about somebody else's country and

Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could offer this point of clarification. Taylor Brelsford. I actually worked with the people in Aniak in conducting the mapping interviews that are the basis of the finding or the suggestion that people from Aniak do use some parts of Unit 18. And the lands in question, Gail, are not down below Tulukska or at great distance away from the village at all. The lands being contemplated here would be in the Paimiut Slough area between Kalskag and the Yukon River, for example. Behind Kalskag there, the boundary of Unit 18 and 19 runs back there and people do harvest a little bit west of the Unit 19 boundary north of the village of Kalskag, for example, or again in -- in the case of Aniak south of the village near Ophir and Whitefish Lake people go back to harvest caribou and moose in that area, that's also in the boundary between Unit 18 and 19. So it's really the upriver boundary of Unit 18 that's being talked about here when we're talking about Kalskag, Aniak, Kwethluk having some harvest practices, patterns inside of the Unit 18 boundary.

It's never intended, nobody would suggest that people would go great distances for black bear. They're more closely available. So with that small clarification I'll leave you guys to figure out what's best.

MR. REAKOFF: I have one question about Paimiut. Is that in or out of 18? Is that in 19? This map we've got it's a 19-

(Off record comments re looking for maps)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jeff, did you have further comment?

MR. DENTON: Yeah, I'm very familiar with that piece of country. The line of Unit 18 and 19 in the area of Paimiut Slough goes to the west of the mouth of Paimiut Slough. All of Paimiut Slough is included in Area 21(E) -- or 21(A), which is it?

(Off record comments)

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have also these more blown up maps of that makes it clearer what we're talking about. We had them yesterday, but I have extras today.

MR. DENTON: The Paimiut Slough in its entirety is not in Unit 18. The mouth of Paimiut Slough comes into the Yukon River to the east of the boundary line.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Paimiut is right on the -- it's like it runs through the community or

MR. BRELSFORD: And I think Jeff's correct as far as the technical designation of the water body, the water shed.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. BRELSFORD: Local people in the Kalskags when they talk about going hunting north of the village towards the Yukon they call that the Paimiut Slough area. It's a local usage and

it is not bounded. It goes on both side of the Unit 18/19 boundary.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. BRELSFORD: And so when I use the term Paimiut or Paimiut Slough I'm using it in a way that people in Kalskag did.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. Uh-hum. Well, we have no motion before us. What is your wishes? No action.

MR. SIMON: If there's no action then move onto the next one.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Yeah. If there's

MR. SIMON: We have a lot of other business to attend to.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I guess that's the wishes of the group. No action on the proposal either from lack of knowledge of the area or the feeling that it's outside of our jurisdiction. They don't want to take any action on it.

MR. MATHEWS: I still see some questioning in faces on one of your council members here that it might be good to just wait a minute or two or is she comfortable with taking no action on it.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Are you talking about me again?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I'm talking about you. You can still take no action and come back to it, you know, later in the meeting if that

MS. VANDERPOOL: I can do that, yeah (ph).

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then we will go on to Proposal 41.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. 41.

MR. MATHEWS: Proposal 41 is similar except it's dealing with Moose in Unit 18. Request that communities of Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Napamute be added to the customary and traditional use determination for moose in Unit 18.

The presenter or author of this proposal, I believe, is Herman Morgan. It starts on Page 69 of your book.

The public comment on 41 -- no, this is actually your council proposal. Sorry. It was presented by Herman Morgan, but this is actually your proposal that you put together. I apologize for that.

The Kwethluk Joint Group opposes it. It will increase hunting pressure on low density moose populations in Unit 18 as compared to Unit 19. Many Unit 18 residents from Lower Kuskokwim have not been able to hunt in Unit 19 due to the high cost of land use permit fees imposed by the Kuskokwim Corporation.

The Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council adopted the proposals. Preliminary conclusion including residents of Unit 19(A) living downstream of the Holokuk River, residents of Chuathbaluk, Aniak, Lowe Kalskag, Holy Cross, Stebbins, St. Michael and Togiak for moose in Unit 18. Lower Kalskag should be affirmed because of its location on the Unit 18 boundary. So that's the actions of the Yukon Kuskokwim Regional Advisory Council and George can provided your proposal analysis on Proposal 41.

MR. LOHSE: This is as with the other c&t proposals the -- when we talked about opening up or looking at the use of moose by residents in Unit 18 that were not currently residents of Unit 18. As I said yesterday our direction is to not just limit to those in the proposal but to try to work towards getting a more perfect solution and look at other ones.

We had ticket harvest data and map data. Again, I'm going to assume that it is a general concurrence that these communities all qualify as subsistence criteria and meet all of the eight criteria except for the question of where. Page --

figure 3, it must be page 79, starting on 79, there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, about eight or nine pages of maps showing subsistence areas as collected by the Division of Subsistence and other agencies. Showing areas used with 18 by communities outside of 18.

In the conclusions that Vince basically just read to you the staff felt that there was certainly evidence to support the proposal's request for including the villages identified in here, but also felt that there was equal evidence to add the additional villages of Holy Cross, Stebbins, St. Michaels, Togiak, those ones identified within the preliminary conclusions.

And, Vince, did you say that the other Council adopted this proposal as amended?

MR. MATHEWS: That's my understanding.

MR. SHERROD: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: But whatever's in the preliminary conclusions.

MR. SHERROD: So they basically accepted the preliminary conclusions as presented in this document.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that's the Yukon Kuskokwim Advisory, they adopted it you're saying?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that's with the inclusion of the communities of Holy Cross,

MR. SHERROD: It's right there on page 77. It includes the rural residents of 19(A) so that would be living down straight from the Holokuk River resident of Chuathbaluk, Anvik (sic), Lower Kalskag, Holy Cross, Stebbins, St. Michael, which

I believe are in Unit 22, Togiak to the customary and traditional eligibility determinations for moose in Unit 18.

Upper Kalskag is already included, however, there exist some uncertainty whether Lower Kalskag is included because of its position on the Unit 18 boundary. So that's sort of like a Paimiut question there.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any more analysis? Questions?

MR. SIMON: Move to adopt.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Moved by Pollock, seconded by?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Me. Angela.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Angela. I have a little concern that this might come back to haunt us. What if they come forward and say, 18, look, we granted you subsistence rights in our unit where you had demonstrated a use, how come you won't grant us a use in subsistence -- or c&t determinations in 19 because the area crosses that boundary.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: 19. I was worried about 21(E).

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: There's a problem is that borderline. Now, you've got to keep in mind that now we're coming into them and saying we want c&t findings in Unit 18, you see. And that's what they were asking for. Stan.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes. I'll just bring this up (ph). My name is Stan Sheppard from Mountain Village. In this, in these passing these proposals giving the villages up out of 18 c&t opportunity would the proposals we talked about 45 and 46 yesterday in going back to our villages, you know, these other committees that we're going to be dealing with Unit 18, 21, 21(E) and 19. They look at these other proposals like this that gives these outside villages that say they have practice c&t authorization to go ahead and come into Unit 18 and practice that. And you know, by taking these as example, these will be working more, promising to what we're trying to achieve with our

upriver people Unit 21(E) along with Unit 18 (ph).

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: The reason I'm agreeing with this proposal is that there's one family that was raised in Paimiut, they only moved to Holy Cross because of the educational, they can go to school. They were born and raised down in Paimiut and that's why I'm agreeing with letting them use their own land where they're born and raised to hunt. It's only one family. Because some of these other families, I know, (indiscernible) Paimiut, you know, you see a real big place but they've moved over to Kalskag. They're still part of this original family that was there. And there's a -- they do hunt down in Paimiut before we hunt in Holy Cross. They go downriver. That's where their fish camp is. That's where they were born. They know the country good. They go moose hunting there. That's the only reason I'm agreeing with it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I hear that. But what we're finding is that all residents of Holy Cross have c&t, that's what we would be doing by listing that community.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: But not everybody goes down river either. There's only one family that goes down river.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Not everybody in Holy Cross goes down river. We go to Innoko and we go to (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Okay. But that's the same argument they've been proposing for some coming up because there's some families that have hunted across that boundary. George, you know, I

MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair, this is an option that I don't think we've put forward before, but I think that this body has

the right to exercise. And I'm throwing it out in front of you.

Unit 18, I think, is a very big unit and if we looked in the bear information we have a fairly diverse number of communities. One way to deal with very big units is to subdivide it for different purposes. In Unit 12, for example, we have different c&t divisions for different species. We have it subdivided for caribou differently than it is 12 (ph).

I would think one of the options that this body has available to it would be to support a proposal like this, but support it with the understanding that this draft -- the staff draft wording that would limit the c&t to those areas identified in by these maps.

Now, that would not include all of the area. For example, in the Stebbins case it might be simply the drainages of -- on page -- no, it's figure 8 in there, east fork of the Andreafsky and the Andreafsky River, for example. But it might be possible to instead of doing all or no, that refinements could be made here. And probably the same question or the same option would be available when it comes to resolving the issue of the down river/up river use. And as I say this is an option.

The other option would be to simply to have this to be rejected, I suppose, as worded and request that -- this is your proposal. I mean that you could request that you reconsider it next year with this modification in there so that you knew exactly what you were dealing with. Or, as I say, you could -- since it's your proposal you could request that staff simply draft legislation -- or draft wording in the regulation that would divide this into sub-units.

The pitfall of this as we start becoming more and more cumbersome in our regulations and if we do this for each and every case we're going to wind up with an encyclopedia being packed around by each and every hunter trying to figure out who hunts where and when. But it's an option I think you should be aware of. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: This proposal doesn't include Holy Cross in the -- you know, 41. It just has Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Paimiut. It doesn't have Holy Cross in the

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's right.

MR. REAKOFF: proposal. Did you want to amend the proposal to include Holy Cross?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Just leave it the way it is, 41.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, we proposed that, didn't we? I would feel more comfortable if it was fine tuned. I would not like us to set the precedent of claiming subsistence use in all of Unit 18 because of use of a small portion of that area for moose hunting because now moose are extending their range clear down to the mouth of the Yukon and so on, you see. And we're saying we're making a blanket statement of all of 18. That's exactly what the proposals that we rejected or that we tabled were doing. They were asking for findings in all of Unit 19.

Based on that principle I think it would be -- I could not support this as it is right now without fine tuning. Do you see what I mean? Because I think we're going to be asking -- looking at a solution in 45 and 46 if it's adopted at all, some kind of fine tuning so that it doesn't include all of the unit. And so, I don't think we'd want to in this one just make a blanket statement for the whole area. That's where I'm at.

MS. VANDERPOOL: If you did that you'd be saying that these people from Unit 19 or 21(E) or whatever can go to Mekoryuk and have customary use and traditional

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: therein and then it'll just

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, you're opening it up. The problem in the future that I think is going to face all of us is

how do we fine tune these so that we really meet customary and traditional needs, but are not dealing with these large areas where they're going to cause conflict between users.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Uh-hum.

MR. REAKOFF: Well, this proposal could be instead of Unit 18, it could be Unit 18 as far as a certain distance.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Couldn't you identify the areas as Taylor was saying, you know, that were being used

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, that's what George was suggesting, if we had worried that would -- as identified on the mapping as on the use map or something.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Uh-hum. If I recall right, is that -- that's what

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Now, the other option would be to take the same action we did on 45 and 46 is ask that it be deferred by the Board, that they not take action on this now and that there be further discussion and fine tuning. And then this could be placed on the table with 45 and 46 and they could look at those together

MS. VANDERPOOL: Uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: and how they would fine tune those.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Fine tune those, uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So we'd be taking an action consistent with what we did before by

MS. VANDERPOOL: Uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: asking them to defer it.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I would agree to that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That -- so what is your -- we have no motion before us at this point. So what is

MR. MATHEWS: We do have a motion to adopt and second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh?

MR. MATHEWS: We have a motion to adopt and second by Angela.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I'm sorry. That's right. We're discussing that motion right now, so yes. We could have a move to amend or we could defeat that and then pass on other motions.

MR. MATHEWS: So the mover of the motion could ask the second to withdraw the motion

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Withdraw.

MR. MATHEWS: that would be another way.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. That would be another option. What's

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I didn't make the motion, I just seconded it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay. Would you withdraw

MR. SIMON: I will withdraw my motion.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Is that agreeable with second? Okay. The motion is withdrawn. So now we have no motion before us.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Move to defer.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Move that we ask the Board to defer action on this. Okay. Moved by Harold. Is there a

second?

.

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Second by Jack. Discussion of that motion?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: I think a deferral at this time would be warranted as our deferral yesterday was to allow more discussion of the villages of that area that might be defined as sort of an overlapping area that may be agreeable between Unit 21(E), 19 and 18. And that might come up at our next meeting. There may be a mutual agreement on what distance the overlap's making.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I would certainly feel comfortable with that and I would support this action, defer for that reason. Yeah. Any further discussion of the motion?

All those in favor signify by raising your right hand?

Okay. Yes votes for all members present. Motion carried. We're asking the Board to defer.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that bring us up to Proposal 49 which is on page 88. It deals with Unit 22 caribou. Request a positive customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 22 by residents of Unit 22. Public comments on Proposal 49 and John may want to elaborate on this for the State. But the written comment was -- I don't know their stand on it, but I can read what we have here. This proposal asks the board (1) to make a positive finding for residents of Unit 22(C), (D) and (E); (2), to reverse the existing positive findings for residents of Unit 23, 24, 26(A) and (3) and not make distinctions between Western Arctic herd caribou and other herds that might be present in Unit 22. The proposal does not provide sufficient justification for these modifications and the department is not certain that all these changes are intended.

Okay. We have public comment from Mike Brown, Unalakleet. According to the biologists' reports there does not seem to be a need for the Board to be concerned with restricting the hunting of either of these species (caribou or moose). . From what I understand both moose and caribou numbers are strong; is there data to support such a need? If there is serious need for restrictions, could the Board first consider limiting the number of caribou taking a week by each resident? At present the sum of 35 seems staggering.

Joe Sonneman, Juneau. This appears to be another instance of hungry subsistence users competing with each other, even while other areas might have a surplus. Again, this seems to indicate a need for state-wide fish and game management.

Dan Masters of Point Hope opposes this proposal. There is not a population problem in the area and the proposal reflects an effort to further limit access to public lands.

Thomas Sparks of Nome supports this proposal as it reflects current practice and State regulations.

Two regional councils have already met and discussed this. Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council supports Unit 22 recommendations only. The regional council did not take action on other units.

I'll have to look up further on that one, but anyways, Yukon Kuskokwim Regional Advisory Council adopted the proposal with the modification to include villages north of the Yukon River in Unit 18.

I don't know if we have staff here that was present at the Seward Peninsula. I have a note here that they supported staff -- oh, I'm sorry, my notes are screwed up. Seward Peninsula recommends only for Unit 22. The Northwest Arctic did meet on this and they support the staff conclusion. So three regional councils have already met on this. Seward Peninsula only supports the Unit 22 recommendation. Northwest supports the staff conclusion and the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta supported it

with a modification to include villages north of the Yukon River in Unit 18. And that's all the public comment that I have this moment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Analysis?

MR. SHERROD: I'm going to make a couple of general comments here because the next proposal is similar to this in that some of our caribou proposals are by herd. And there are some problems, not necessarily in your region, but maybe in which herds move. We do have cases, Unit 12, for example, where we have a forty-mile determination and yet currently there are no forty-mile animals there. We have seasons that we adopted from the State that reflect the existence of animals when they were there, and so we have caribou seasons where there currently are no caribou. So caribou making seasons and regulations and c&t determinations based on herds is really, I think, very problematic and, hopefully, we'll move away from that.

What this proposal is requesting is that the elimination basically of all non-22 residents, Unit 22 residents, from hunting caribou, having a c&t determination in Unit 22 and the inclusion actually -- as originally it was 22(A) and (B) and they've included the other residents of Unit 22, so they've expanded the Unit 22 determination and have excluded other users from harvesting or having a positive c&t determination in that unit.

Again, as with the other analysis, the staff went through and reviewed the existing data base to determine who has demonstrated harvesting caribou within Unit 22 and who has not. So we're down to this question of where more than down to the question of did they meet the other criteria of sharing and transmission of knowledge and so on, the other eight factors.

The proposal -- or the primary conclusion with the modification here of including Unit -- this says Unit 22, all caribou, rural residents of Unit 22 except St. Lawrence Island. It was obvious lack of data demonstrating the St. Lawrence Island versus travel to the mainland to harvest caribou. And that it suggested including the rural residents of Unit 21(D)

west of the Koyukuk and Yukon Rivers and rural residents of Unit 23 and 24 with reference to Unit 26(A) it is proposed to delete as a result of the analysis of Proposal 65. I don't understand that because I didn't do 65, nor have I read 65.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: George, I'm having trouble following this because I'm not as used to the units up there

MR. SHERROD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there any way we could use an overhead or something so that we could see as you're explaining.

MR. SHERROD: I don't

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I know it will help me. I don't know about other members.

MR. SHERROD: We may be able to look in the book.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. 'Cause at this point I'm not sure who's asking to exclude who.

(Off record comments)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Can this one over here be used?

MR. SHERROD: Yeah. You have that included in here.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. So

MR. SHERROD: I don't know if that helps. Do we have enough of these books?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

MR. SHERROD: That might be a solution. However, Taylor just clarified something that I didn't understand. The conclusion here, this is the staff has taken a little bit of a different twist. I guess it's sort of a compromise similar to a situation we're faced with black bear in Unit 18, is that the

staff is recommending that a positive customary and traditional use determination be granted to all the units of Unit 22 except those domiciled on St. Lawrence Island. In respect to the other communities we have basically a no determination situation again because, I guess, the feeling was that there wasn't a full analysis. There wasn't a full enough analysis done to justify excluding other users that may have a claim, I guess, particularly given the status of the herd and the current -- I mean our Federal herd is basically year round, five animals a day, so there doesn't seem to be a problem with the resource.

So basically adopting this as amended would only grant Unit 22 individuals with the recognition that they do take animals.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SHERROD: It would not functionally change anything until the staff brought more definitive information in front of this body, obviously, and other councils affected and the Board to include or in this case exclude communities that aren't residents of Unit 22 but hunt in Unit 22.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. So we just say no determination

MR. SHERROD: It would say Unit 22 customary and traditional use and then it would list the ones that are already there. And I'm not sure what the wording would be. Maybe Taylor can tell me because this is a new twist.

MR. BRELSFORD: It's not really no determination because there is a determination in the unit, but it in effect, the status quo would not change. There would be no change in the status of villages previously recognized, but un-analyzed in this current review. No change in their status would occur without a specific analysis of their uses.

So what you are doing in this is, what the proposal boils down to is confirming that residents of Unit 22 use caribou in a customary and traditional fashion inside of Unit

22. You're quiet. You're silent on the uses by neighboring people to the north, to the east and to the south until a focused analysis is conducted

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that is the staff's recommendation?

MR. BRELSFORD: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So if we move to adopt the staff's recommendation then the wording would be as you're describing it then?

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MR. SHERROD: It would functionally add because I think the current situation does not include all units of 22, so it would add a few communities in Unit 22. It would grant them a recognized customary and traditional use of the resource, but it would not exclude those communities that previously had a recognized use.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. BRELSFORD: Another small point of clarification. Clarence asked us to mention again what George has said already and that is that the status of the Gamble -- of the St. Lawrence Island villages would change under this finding. They would be excluded.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. BRELSFORD: They would not have a recognized customary and traditional use for caribou on mainland Unit 22 as a result of this.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But they would on those on the

island, right, cause there's caribou on the island, isn't there?

MR. SHERROD: No.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, there isn't. I thought there was
.....

MR. SHERROD: There were reindeer, but to the best of my knowledge there haven't been reindeer on the island since the '70s.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay. Okay. Questions about the analysis and where we're at from the members?

Do we have a motion concerning this?

As I understand it now if you move to support the staff recommendation then you're just recognizing those communities that were listed in 22 to have customary and traditional and it's not changing the status of those over in our area until such time as there's further determinations. Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt what the staff's amendment --

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: To adopt the staff's recommendation, the amendment of this which is the staff's of proposal, whatever the number, 49. Okay. Is there a second to that?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes. Harold seconds. Any discussion of that?

All those in favor signify by raising your hand?

Okay. It's yes votes for all members present. Motion carried.

At this time we're getting close to -- we're approaching noon. And I'm not sure how much time the next one would have.

I had a request from Dave Mills who has another meeting at 1:00 o'clock and from the National Park Service, is that right? He wanted to report on something that will take five to 10 minutes. With your permission I'd like to do that now. Okay. Yes, George.

MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair, a piece of unfinished business associated with this last proposal. It will only take a minute

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SHERROD: Is that as the person is probably going to be stuck with analyzing or determining which of these communities in your area use these animals, perhaps something can be done prior to the fall season or something to try to amass or to collect information, elicit information from the communities that may reflect or support or negate a claim to this area. Am I making myself

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Because you're saying the fall season might be affected

MR. SHERROD: No, right now it wouldn't affect it, but I would suspect that if we take this up this fall, this proposal to increase or decrease the c&t determination will be before you again. What I'm saying is our information data base is limited and this body may consider making some sort of motion after this

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. SHERROD: to try to ensure the communities in your area

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. SHERROD: have a fair chance of getting included based on data collection.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So the motion requesting that

information be gathered on communities in what is the unit, 22
-- in Unit 24,

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 21.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Okay. Does someone want to make a motion to that effect that would be related to this. It's just a request that staff spend some time developing information so that we have it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Moved by Harold. Is there a second?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, Gail second. Okay. Sorry. And that is on Units 24 and 21. Okay. Any discussion of the motion?

All those in favor signify by raising your right hand.

Okay. Again yes votes for all members present. Motion carried.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on the next topic, not to jump on you there, sorry, Section tab 7 in your brown book, it's probably buried under all the other stuff, has a copy of the draft review of subsistence law and National Park Service regulations. You were mailed a copy around the 1st of December of this and Mr. Mills will be here to present this report. So if you want to turn to tab 7 you'll have the report in front of you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Dave, go ahead.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Dave Mills, I've recently been hired as the -- in the past year

the superintendent of the Gates of the Arctic National Park. And more recently in our reorganization I also have responsibility for Yukon Charley Rivers National Preserve.

I wanted to just take a few minutes and we won't go into great detail here, just to explain a little bit about the background and the process that we're going through with what we're calling this issue paper that's in your booklet there.

There was a group of primarily park field based employees that thought it was probably time to take a look closely 15 years after ANILCA, take a close look at how we're doing in managing the parks with regards to subsistence activities out there. So this group for the past year or so -- I haven't been involved with it till recently here, but the past year or so got together -- this is a group of Park Service employees just to kind of review the regulations and policies and some of the legislation and the legislative history behind what's evolving with subsistence regulations specific to national parks. And this group drafted a few ideas that are all in the -- is that too loud?

COURT REPORTER: No, not for me. Get in front of the mike. I was just trying to make it louder so people could hear in the back.

MR. MILLS: They met internally and discussed some of the kind of re-occurring challenges and problems that we often run into and started to draft up some of these issues and ideas and provide a little background on this.

In the middle of it, some new folks including myself that have started to get involved in the process thought it would be good to rather than take that internal review too far, go ahead and share that especially with regional council and our subsistence resource commission before it was too developed so that they were properly involved as ANILCA describes in the process. So that's exactly where we're at on this. This is a draft that's not even completed. It's a very rough draft that is, in my mind, is a start in identifying some of the important issues over the past 15 years that keep resurfacing specific to

management of subsistence in national parks.

I've been asked recently to chair the internal group with the Park Service to continue this process. And we just thought it would be good to share where we're at right now with it internally and share the draft with you at this point. We plan to be discussing or we have been discussing the specifics in this issue paper with the subsistence resource commission for each park. We want to continue to do that. There's really no deadline on the discussion, however, we're hoping sometime in May or about then to compile what we have so far in terms of comments. But I look at this as an ongoing process just kind of to evaluate where we're at in addressing some of the issues out there.

So it's really kind of a 15 year review. And some of the purposes that we talked about -- or this group talked about that we're -- they felt critical to be a part of this review was to take a look at areas where we could be a little more consistent between parks, make sure where we can that we come up with consistent policies or regulations or guidelines even. But also recognize that there may be opportunities or reason to recognize regional diversity in certain areas that certainly parks down such as Denali along the road system or Wrangell-St. Elias might be quite different in terms of subsistence activities than Northwest Alaska or other parts.

Another theme that came up was we need to do a better job in coordinating between parks, as I mentioned before we can do that. And then, I guess, where this all fits together in my mind is that this is an opportunity internally for the Park staff to do a little work on their own that is much along the line of what the subsistence resource commissions have been doing all along, you know, in terms of developing a hunting plan. That's our main charge or hunting recommendations. This is an opportunity to kind of organize internally with the Park Service staff where their concerns are and what the focus in the future ought to be and then share that with the groups before it becomes regulation or any sort of policy. So it's really an incomplete draft. We look at it as a continuous process. We're starting that process now. We want to -- I see the regional

council as important to this process. We've got some very active members on both the Denali Subsistence Commission as well as the Gates to the Arctic Commission here that have been real involved in developing hunting plans. And we look forward to their guidance and your guidance on this in the future on that.

The other important thing if you look through the start of the plan, I think that is a good start is that what we're calling the subsistence policy statement, just some general statements that haven't been made in the past that I think are a good start to help guide our employees as to what sort of philosophy or direction in a general sense that they should be taking as they work on issues and with regards to park management and subsistence.

As you know, quite often we get new employees that don't have a lot of experience, so we were hearing from the field, let's have some sort of written policy and some guidelines so that when new people come in or for that matter anybody we can have some consistency in what we're doing. And I think that's a good start there. I think we can add a lot more to that, but things like -- that are obvious to me that it's certainly a priority by law and also by policy that we protect the opportunity for local residents to continue the tradition of subsistence activities. Recognize that activities continue to evolve and that we need to understand that if we are to allow these opportunities to continue we've got to recognize a certain amount of change and evolution that takes place as time goes on.

We want to make sure that we ensure that the management of the parks is consistent with the requirement that we maintain natural and healthy populations and that we use -- incorporate scientific data as well as traditional knowledge within those value. And that we do -- we continue and perhaps improve upon our -- the way we're communicating with board like the Regional Council here and the subsistence resource commissions and the public in the management of subsistence and understanding the cultural values and park values and trying to work on that. So it's a -- this is just a general philosophy that we've never had written on paper that we want to develop.

And then what follows after that, I won't go into great detail here, but is a list of issues and kind of a summary of the regulations and the legislation followed by -- these aren't recommendations, but possible action items. That's probably where as you review this, if you want to take a look at those action items, that's probably the -- a good place to focus on.

I think as this group continues here we'll be able to add some more ideas and in the full spectrum of possible actions and the action items.

Just some general categories without going into great detail include, I think, the chairman talked a little bit about the responsibilities of the subsistence commissions yesterday, but eligibility is one that these subsistence commissions deal with quite a bit. Access issues specific to parks. Cabins, these are all things that probably interest you all, but as a Regional Council you're probably more focused on the wildlife regulations. Trapping is one that we've talked a lot about at Gates of the Arctic. And I know that's been an issue around the state. We've got some good feedback on some proposed -- or some existing regulations and how to deal with that. I think through this process we'll come up with a good options on dealing with some of our present trapping regulations that affect park areas. Customary trade, there's some accommodations for allowing customary trade in some of the parks. And then the organization of the subsistence resource commissions.

So, in my mind this is a -- as we form our new group at the Park Service internally this will kind of build upon this rough draft here and work with the subsistence commissions in whatever level you feel appropriate with the Regional Council here to look at this as an evaluation after 15 years and develop a continuing process so that we can -- when the time's right and there's a consensus to move forward on some of these issues that, hopefully, have answers, some of them may not, but things that we can pick off bit by bit we'll want to do that. So, in a nutshell, that's without getting into the details. We can certainly talk about that either with the subsistence commission or later on here if you'd like about some of the details in this.

I know this doesn't affect everyone on the commission here but we've got three strong representatives, at least, for two of the park areas that have been very active with the commission. And we appreciate that and we look forward to continuing working with them.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions for Dave?

MR. REAKOFF: I have one or two questions or comments. One is how many park people are working on this draft currently putting their heads together?

MR. MILLS: The draft that you see there was the result of, I think, about five or six people that started it out. What I'm proposing to do here in the near future is have about the same size working group, but we're going to try to involve the field staff a little bit more in kind of sub-working groups and kind of farm out on different issues with some of the groups out there, so we'll get more staff involved. And I know every park is primarily going to use the subsistence resource commission as a key contact to continue to work on these issues.

None of these are new issues really. These have been around forever, but where we can I think we need to start picking off things that we all agree upon and move forward and start focusing our energy on some of those other topics that seem to just hanging around.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Another question?

MR. REAKOFF: I was wondering if all of the SRCs are currently have this at the top of their agenda list like the Gates of the Arctic, it's tough

MR. MILLS: I know the Wrangells commission just met the last week, maybe two weeks ago, was that last week or the last couple of weeks and they spent quite a bit of time focusing on this from what I hear. I'm not sure when the next Denali meeting is, but

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I don't know when the next one is. But we were aware that this was going on. At one point there they were going to have us involved as a committee but it was going to take too much time so they threw up their hands, but they were going to involve us just in the development process or that's what had been proposed there.

MR. MILLS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I do have a question about procedure that I think would be pertinent is that it would be good if before you actually come up with your first draft or publish it in the Public Register and so on that the resource councils and perhaps even these be allowed to get some input into it

MR. MILLS: Uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: so that you have things to consider as you're finalizing your draft, rather than us responding to something that's already drafted. That might be appropriate to think about that. I think it would be better to have the input then, then we're not dealing with something that's already out and we're just another commenter with everybody else.

MR. MILLS: Uh-hum. I agree. I think that's a really good concern and that's one of the reasons I wanted even though this process has been going on for awhile with this draft that we kind of just stop where we're at and not take it too far yet and make sure that it's in sync with our subsistence commissions and regional councils, but I kind of look at this as rather than a product that's suddenly provides answers to all this stuff as a continuing process and where we can bit by bit through the years, if a regulation or policy is needed and agreed upon then we'll just in that particular case go ahead with that rather than coming out with a paper that recommends solving all the problems at once here.

A lot of these are just internal recommendations. A few would require some sort of rule making. And, of course, that would go through the rule making process after it goes through

this process and with the subsistence commission.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Will that be adopted, be in the Federal Register then or what

MR. MILLS: No, we're not looking at this as any sort of rule making

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MILLS: This is an internal document that kind of explains to park employees as well as the public eventually how we intend to operate internally. And wherever there's any regulatory changes needed or additional regulations that would have to go through -- hopefully, through the subsistence commissions and then through some sort of rule making process. So this is kind of a step to get our own house in order a little bit more.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So I guess my comment would be before you actually finalize your draft to go out to the units in there

MR. MILLS: Uh-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: be allowed to have input because we might see things that you missed or directed (ph) before you do that final

MR. MILLS: Yes, I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. REAKOFF: I would like to express my appreciation to the National Park Service for bringing this document forward to the regional council and the SRCs and stopping and opening their ears to the local input. That was the problem with the re-arranging fur bearer problem and that -- I think that open dialogue between the SRC as a primary and the regional council to the Federal Board is the proper channels. And I appreciate your input to this council.

MR. MILLS: Okay. We'll look forward to continuing to work on this.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: On that if the copy you have in your book, the copy machine flipped some pages so I have copies that are in the correct order or you can just flip the pages. I just wanted to let you know that when we started tracking this it goes from page 1 to page 3 in your book, but there are other copies, so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. So it's just a matter of some pages being turned around

MR. MATHEWS: As far as I can figure or I can give you other copies. I just wanted to make you aware of that if you start going batty trying to figure out page numbers.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Pollock?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. This SRC a required task (ph) at least one meeting once a year?

MR. MILLS: Well, one of the discussions in there was to, I think, encourage. I think there may even be some legislative language that encourages the subsistence commissions to meet once a year so that was one of the -- I think that's right out of the legislative history and what these commissions were all about. I think with -- some commissions are more active than others. The -- I think the Denali and Gates, the commissions in your area are probably the two most active ones around. It hasn't been a problem. I think a they've met two, sometimes three times a year, but that came right from the Congressional legislative history encouraging these commissions to meet at least once a year and to make sure that we provide -- the Park Service provides the support to make that happen.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, Dave.

MR. MILLS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think with that we're within two minutes to noon. I think it's time to consider a break for lunch. How long, how much time do you need? One hour? Okay. 1:00 o'clock. Okay. We'll recess till 1:00 o'clock.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Not too bad, 1:12. Proposal 65.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Proposal 65 deals with caribou in Unit 26. It's on page 99. It would substitute the customary and traditional use determination request. It would substitute residents of Unit 26, Anaktuvuk Pass, Wiseman and Point Hope current customary and traditional use determination. Public comment on Proposal 65 and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, they're neutral on this proposal. The proposal would eliminate residents of Unit 21(D) west, 22(A), 23 and most of 24. The proposal says nothing about wanting the Board to reverse existing positive c&t findings.

The North Slope Regional Advisory Council at their recent meeting supported with the following modification. Modification of Unit 26(A) and (C), all Unit 26 residents plus Point Hope and Anaktuvuk Pass. For Unit 26(B) all Unit 26 residents, Point Hope, Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman. The Regional Council was reluctant to pass recommendations for villages outside their region. And that's all the comments I have and there may be a little bit more on North Slope's action, but that's all the comments I have on Proposal 65.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Analysis then?

MR. SHERROD: Proposal 65 would eliminate the herd specification and go to any caribou. And as worded would remove from the positive determination all communities except those

within Unit 26 and would grant a positive determination for all Unit 26 communities, not just 26(A), so in some ways this proposal is similar to the one that you guys just reviewed in that it potentially eliminates users from Unit 24 from being able to harvest caribou in Unit 26 if, in fact, that is the case.

Again as with the other analysis the individual who put this together, I believe it was Helen Armstrong, reviewed existing data bases to find out which communities not only within those identified to be effected by the proposal, but outside of the proposal would be effected and came up with the conclusion that the proposal should be modified as follows. Unit 26(A) residents of Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, Atqasuk, Barrow, Nuiqsut, Anaktuvuk Pass which would be the Unit 26 communities, Unit 26(B) residents of Nuiqsut, Kaktovik and Wiseman and Unit 26(C) residents of Kaktovik, that these communities meet the eight criteria for determining the use of caribou in the sub-units.

What effects this body here is that Unit 24 residents no long are recognized. That is again if maybe -- you know, it's quite possible that it was -- that they were erroneously included in the first place, but if adopted this proposal in both it's original and it's suggested modified form would not include Unit 24 residents.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Except Wiseman is mentioned, isn't it?

MR. SHERROD: I'm sorry, Wiseman is in there, yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, right.

MR. SHERROD: And Anaktuvuk Pass.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. Is there a recommendation then?

MR. SHERROD: That is the recommendation. The original proposal

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, that modified (ph)

MR. SHERROD: is simply for Units -- residents of all unit -- or, excuse me, of all Sub-Units in 26 only and the recommendation is to include some non-26 communities and to break it down and so that there is a -- there is a determination for Unit 26(A), for Unit 26(B) and for Unit 26(C) instead of a blanket unit 26 determination. Maybe I'll try to make that clear up here.

Unit 26(A), the suggested or preliminary conclusion would be for the residents of Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, Atkasuk, Barrow and Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk Pass. In Unit 26(B) it would be residents of Nuiqsut, Kaktovik and Wiseman. And in Unit 26(C) it would be residents of Kaktovik, so instead of being a blanket Unit 26 c&t determination for all residents of Unit 26 regardless of sub-units. The preliminary conclusions suggest modifying it in such a way that it breaks it up into the three -- a determination for each of the sub-units and it includes non-unit 26 communities in the case of Wiseman within one of those determinations.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: As being the closest resident to the Unit 26, people from Anaktuvuk aren't into Unit 26(B). How come they're not included in the Unit 26(B)

MR. SHERROD: Analysis. I didn't do the analysis on this. Vince, do we have any information on the action that the North Slope Council took on this in respect to that question or -- I think we have someone here that can answer that question.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, Dave can

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel with BLM. The North Slope Regional Advisory Council felt that all of their communities on the North Slope represent one large community, so to speak, and they did not want to separate themselves up into distinct communities for the purpose of this c&t and that's why they gave

all eight of the Inupiaq Villages of the North Slope Borough c&t and all three sub-units of 26 which includes Point Hope which by the way is in GMU 23, but it's in the North Slope Borough and it includes Anaktuvuk Pass which is -- I think it's just south of the boundary line. I'm not sure. And then they recognize that folks of Wiseman have use in 26(B) and so they included Wiseman in that sub-unit only.

MR. MATHEWS: So the North Slope did add Anaktuvuk Pass to 26(B)?

MR. YOKEL: Yeah, they included all eight of their villages in all three sub-units in the recommendation that they made.

MR. MATHEWS: The wording I got was that 26(A) and (C) all residents of Unit 26 in Point Hope and Anaktuvuk Pass. For Unit 26(B) all residents of Unit 26 and Anaktuvuk Pass, Point Hope and Wiseman.

MR. YOKEL: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question. Is it true that none -- no one from your area goes up that far from Alatna or Bettles, I guess, would be the other closest.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Allakaket?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So what's your wishes concerning this proposal? Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: In that proposal form itself it doesn't lists -- it lists the rural residents of Unit 26 and it doesn't mention Wiseman in the official (indiscernible) that it's proposing and that's a concern that I have is that it's not actually listed in the proposal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: The staff recommendation was the one that was listing, is that right?

MR. SHERROD: That's my -- the staff recommendation is listed and I believe it just said that the North Slope Subsistence -- your counterpart has recommended included Wiseman as well.

MR. REAKOFF: So we don't have the current -- this isn't their current proposal?

MR. SHERROD: It would have to be modified. You would have to modify the proposal either as stipulated in the preliminary conclusion on page 108 or in some other format. As stipulated in 108 the modification would include Wiseman in 26(B). My understanding is that the North Slope Council has adopted it as modified here, but has also put in Anaktuvuk Pass in 26(B) as you identified as being used, is that

MR. MATHEWS: That's what they did and so the wording on 108 does not reflect the addition of Anaktuvuk Pass in 26(B). So one way would be to -- to go would be to adopt the same motion that the North Slope did or draft a different one or go with the proposal as written.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is one option not to speak about whether the other one should be in or out, but just move that Wiseman be included, because that's the only one that affects us or do we have to speak to the whole proposal?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure you could go that route or make it clear that you're addressing where Wiseman hunts caribou in 26.

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman, that's somewhat similar to what the North Slope Council did. They expressed reservations about making determinations for people themselves in the North Slope Borough such as Wiseman. They knew that Wiseman had some use so they put them in 26(B). They weren't sure about other communities and they -- that's why they expressed their reservations about that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I find it a little hard to be voting on saying Anaktuvuk should be in all of that unit with -- you know, without knowledge.

MR. REAKOFF: But Anaktuvuk is in Unit 24 so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. Oh, it's actually in ours.

MR. REAKOFF: It's in our unit.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So we should speak to both Anaktuvuk and Wiseman then.

MR. YOKEL: Well, Anaktuvuk Pass is represented on the North Slope Council. It -- they gerrymandered the region boundary to include it.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh, that's right, but that changed didn't it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, remember we -- that was one of the earlier

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: proposals that moved them to that (ph).

MR. YOKEL: The GMU boundary actually goes just north of town. I mean, just a few feet north of town, but they are part of the North Slope Borough and that North Slope community and they wanted to be included in the North Slope subsistence region so that change was made.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So I defer to the members that are closest to it as to how you want to proceed. Is there anyone else that has questions about this?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about Allakaket never goes up on the Arctic side, Bettles

MR. REAKOFF: So I make a motion to allow c&t for residents of -- the residents of Unit 24 living in Wiseman to be included into the Unit 26(B).

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Into the proposal -- I guess you could just refer to the proposal?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, the Proposal 65. And that would -- would that cover it then?

MR. SHERROD: Well, if -- that would be -- as the proposal was written we'd have to make -- it's currently all of Unit 26 not just 26(B). I suppose you could suggest the modification -- well

MR. REAKOFF: So they went with the blanket Unit 26?

MR. SHERROD: They went with the blanket unit.

MR. REAKOFF: Okay. It's 26. I won't call it 26(B). I'm modifying my motion to align with the Region 10's designation (ph).

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, you can still make it 'cause we don't have a second yet, so

MR. REAKOFF: Okay. The motion is to include the residents of Unit 24 for c&t within Game Management Unit 26 for Proposal 65.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there a second to that?

MR. SIMON: I second it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Seconded by Pollock.

MR. YOKEL: As I understand it that's exactly how the proposal is originally written and so you're basically adopting the

MR. SHERROD: No, because there's no Wiseman so it would

read rural residents of Unit 26.

MR. YOKEL: It says Wiseman right there (ph).

MR. SHERROD: This is -- oh, Anaktuvuk Pass, Wiseman and Point Hope.

MR. YOKEL: Right. So that's basically you would be adopting the proposal as it was originally written.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Except that we're not speaking definitively about the other communities, see what I mean.

MR. YOKEL: Oh, I see.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Saying that Wiseman should be included in that determination and we acting to say, yes, we agree with that, that inclusion. Understand. Any questions about the mo- -- comments on the motion? Gail?

MS. VANDERPOOL: No, I'm just babbling.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay. Well, you don't have a question then?

MS. VANDERPOOL: No.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. REAKOFF: Can I remodify my -- I would feel a lot more comfortable including Anaktuvuk -- into 24 residents of Anaktuvuk and Wiseman.

MR. SHERROD: I misread that, maybe I can clarify that. And Dave pointed this out to me and I apologize. I didn't write this and I'm stumbling through it. As proposed it would be Unit 26 caribou and that would be both the Central Arctic Herd and the Western Arctic Herd.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Teshekpuk Herd and the Porcupine Herd.

MR. SHERROD: All the herd. Rural residents of Unit 26 and Anaktuvuk Pass, Wiseman and Point Hope and that would -- I guess that would catch the two Unit 24 communities of Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman, none of the others and would add the Unit 23 community of Point Hope, is that correct? And it would be all sub-units of 26.

(Off record comments by all)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Back to you, Jack. You -- we've got a motion and a second. Now, do you -- if you need to change it you talk with approval of the second. You can -- I would entertain a change.

MR. REAKOFF: No, I think that my motion is correct. My current motion is that the residents of Unit 24 and I would feel more comfortable including Anaktuvuk Pass because they are actually residents of Unit 24. Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: To reiterate our Unit 24 position. So the motion is -- as I understand it then, is that the residents of Unit 24 in Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman would be granted customary and traditional finding on caribou in Unit 26.

MR. REAKOFF: In Unit 26.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that we agree with that or we approve with that, whatever the wording is.

MR. SHERROD: That would basically -- the way it's written and let's say I presented it wrong initially, those two communities are included. Now, they're not identified as Unit 24 communities specifically. The difference in your motion here and what is drafted would be that you would identify them as being Unit 24 communities so it would be Unit 26 all communities, Unit 24 residents of the communities of Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman. The primary difference is that your proposal would not include Point Hope which is a Unit 23 community.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're speaking only for

MR. SHERROD: You're speaking only for your

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Only for residents of 24, yeah, that are affected by this motion.

MR. REAKOFF: We're speaking for the western interior and the northwest can deal with their

MR. SHERROD: So you're not opposing Point Hope being in there. You should make that clear for the record. You're simply are supporting the inclusion of the two communities under your jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, maybe in the comments under we could say that we do not feel comfortable about speaking for residents outside of Unit 24. Yeah, do not oppose, but do not want to take a position on -- on

MR. MATHEWS: And that was Point Hope and what was the other one?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All those communities in 26, yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And just so I'm clear on this you're saying for the entire unit of 26, correct?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, we don't want to try and change their whole position on Unit 26.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any questions on the motion? Okay. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay. Again, yes votes for all members present. The motion carried. Thank you. I believe that's all the proposals, isn't it?

MR. SHERROD: Yes, Mr. Chair, might I be permitted to speak for a minute? When I talked to you yesterday I said that this whole process was changing and we were moving towards a more perfect solution to these problems. One of the problems that I've seen with proposals that have come out of this body

and in the other groups, the ones I'm associated with and not associated with, is that they would benefit from a certain amount of fine tuning.

I know that we have talked about the fall meeting being the time for developing proposals. Unfortunately usually agendas are full, people bring problems to the table and there's really not the opportunity to fine tune these. It's quite different from identifying a problem and some of these problems I've heard today have been around for 20 years. And identifying language in a proposal that will address the problem because certainly there are areas in which little can be done or maybe they need specific refinements. Instead of an entire GMU, maybe a drainage or something like that.

I would really suggest that during the course of the year at any time if you sit around and say, hey, that's a problem, we should do something about it. Get on the phone, call Vince and he can arrange, I think, for 'em. I'm volunteering for Vince here and he should speak up. He can arrange to try to get people together to try to draft these things in a way that -- at least there's a rough draft available when we meet in the fall.

I mean, he can meet with the refuge personnel and so on and you can call me except my number -- I don't have a toll free number, but we have voice mail. If it's the middle of the night and you say, you know, there's a real problem with this, I'm bothered, call, leave a message. We'll get back to you. If it takes one of us coming out to the field. I go to Fort Yukon quite frequently. I can certainly jump on a plane and come to McGrath or Galena and sit down and work with you if you can't work with the local refuge manager. But I would really think is there is some problems, if there's areas that need to be changed, we can do certain things. Not as a committee certainly, but as individuals to get draft proposals brought before this body that can then refine them and take action on them in the fall. And then hopefully next spring we won't be in situations and saying we should have thought a bit more about that. It is a resource.

I know we've talked about having more Council meetings, but there is another way that we can, I think, perhaps find tune these proposals so that we can move at making this a more perfect system. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, we could do that. We did that with individuals submitting proposals in Eastern Interior so we have the options of meeting face-to-face. We can teleconference, use fax machines. Again, I think, George would reinforce this, we wouldn't be evaluating your proposal or your idea. We would be just assisting you in drafting a proposal that reflects your intent and concerns 'cause we made that clear with -- we were dealing with several village proposals that we may ask questions, but we're not the decision makers in that.

We're not saying not to submit proposals. We would just help to make it clear what your intent is and how to best get it before the public. And that -- we can do that. That would -- it would save this Council and everyone else in this whole process a lot of time. And I think we discussed that earlier, you -- the trend now is less proposals, but more complex ones so if we can get those clearer ahead of time then everyone is talking about the same issue and not side issues that may not even be part of the intent of the proposer.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any responses to that or questions?

MR. MATHEWS: And I do have an 800 number and when I do move to Fairbanks the office is going to be in Fairbanks in August. There'll be an 800 number there, but if you forget that number just call the Anchorage one and they can get a hold of us and then we'll call you on that, so don't say, well, he's moving. There's one in Fairbanks. Just call that 800 number that's in front of you and then we'll do the leg work of getting back to you on that, but that would save tremendous amount of time. Also it would allowed George, Conrad and others to start gearing up for analysis or pointing out weak spots in the data so that maybe something else could be done in the meantime. I don't know what, but to fill in those gaps.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you for that suggestion, George. Well taken. Okay. Moving on I noticed that we didn't have public comment period at 9:00 a.m. this morning, but I -- there wasn't any public here unless I missed something. Is there somebody that wanted to speak to us? Okay. I just wanted to point out that we'd overlooked that. Okay. We're down to Item C under -- oh, wait a minute. The National Park Staff, that's what we received already, right?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that was

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: There wasn't anything more on that, I guess.

MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So that was covered. Then we're down to Federal, State and other agency reports.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is the time for the agencies to bring up non-agenda items, concerns, things like that to inform the Council. I can just go down the list or unless you have a preference of an agency. Does the National Park Service have anything else to bring up that wasn't discussed on the agenda? It looks like Clarence Summers from the National Park Service has something to share.

MR. SUMMERS: Yes. Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Council members, there was an issue earlier, I guess, yesterday regarding representation on the Lake Clark SRC and on -- Vince has a current roster of membership and term of appointment, nine members serve. Three are appointed by the Bristol Bay Regional Council. I guess, as I understand it, you're proposing a representative from your region. You'd like appointment authority. An amendment to the charter would have to occur and to initiate, let's say, a change such as that it would take a letter from this Council to the affected Commission and Regional Council which is Bristol Bay. And, hopefully, you can reach a consensus and if you can then the next step would be a letter to the secretary requesting an amendment to the charter and that's it in a nutshell.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Other possibility is what's happened with Denali now, they chose not to amend their charter but there have been members appointed, right, currently there are two. We would like to ensure that there are at least ways to get nominated from Lime Village, mainly, is the one concern here and so on. So maybe they don't need an official designated seat, but it would be good if nominations could go forward from that area because I don't know if they're excluded from the process or what, you know, when they come

MR. SUMMERS: I'll address that. The Governor and the Secretary of Interior are the appointing sources.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. SUMMERS: And so, let's say if anyone, any member of the public can petition both the Governor and the Secretary for membership. And the Governor appoints three members, so does the Secretary. There's a requirement that, hopefully, the individual is a knowledgeable subsistence user in the park. There's a special requirement for regional council appointee and I know that we have three members here who serve on commissions. And you're aware that if a regional council appoints an individual, that individual must be on a regional council or a local advisory committee in the affected area and be eligible for subsistence use in the park. That means meeting the c&t and the NPS resident zone permit or 1344 permit requirements.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that might be difficult for us to do because Phil Graham for awhile was on but now we currently have no one from Lime Village on that

MR. SUMMERS: Well, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that Lime Village is a resident zone for Lake Clark, so eligibility is not a problem

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. SUMMERS: for Lime Village.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. But currently we don't have somebody sitting on the -- oh, I see, it's just one of those criteria.

MR. SUMMERS: The individual would have to be on a local advisory committee,

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. SUMMERS: remember a regional council makes the appointment. The individual, the name that comes forward if it's a regional council appointee, this person should be on a local advisory committee or on the regional council in the affected area. And that would be if we're talking about Western Interior that person would have to sit on the council.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: It's my main concern that the Western Interior side of Lake Clark has representation whether they sit on the regional council doesn't matter. And the Board being the representative for the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Interior would appoint some SRC members for Lake Clark. We could direct -- or request the Board to assure that there's an appointee from the Western Interior in there within their appointing abilities.

MR. MATHEWS: That would be within the Secretary's appointment

MR. SUMMERS: Secretary's appointment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince has a list

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. The concern there is -- and Clarence can clarify that, is the three appointees for the Secretary of Interior, their terms expire February 1st, 1998. They were just recently appointed. The three from the Governor are 1997 and three for Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council are November '96. And as you know, serving on those you serve until replaced so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. But I guess in line with what Jack's saying if we wrote a letter to the Secretary of Interior asking that he give strong consideration to appointing someone from that area if an appointment has not been made from some other source like down in '9- -- next year. We could encourage someone to apply for the Governor's. We could, I guess, write a letter again to Lime and suggest that they use that route, that they turn in a nominee for the Governor's appointment. And then that they'd have another option of turning in, submitting a name in '98. And our main concern was that somebody be on that council from that area, so maybe we could accommodate it that way.

MR. MATHEWS: Wouldn't you want a letter addressed both to the Secretary and to the Governor?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes. Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Just so I'm clear on that because I thought you were indicating that Lime would do that. And I suppose they could, but

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, Lime would be the one that could make the nominations, they're the resident community, but we're just encouraging them to see that somebody gets appointed.

MR. MATHEWS: The other avenue would be to change the charter to get to get one seat assigned, so I don't know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But there I think we have a problem meeting the criteria and because we don't always have someone seated from that area.

MR. REAKOFF: So the easiest way to go is to request

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So you're requesting that the chair say those two letters be drafted?

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. To the Board and to the Secretary.

MR. MATHEWS: To the Secretary. That's why you threw me a loop there. It would be to the Secretary and to the Governor, not to the Federal Subsistence Board.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. We could copy the Federal Subsistence Board on the action, but I'm not sure why we do (ph)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is that a consensus on that, does that sound reasonable to members? Again, many of you aren't -- we aren't directly impacted by that. Okay. Hearing no -- you know, hearing no dissent

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. So two letters, one to the Secretary, one to the Governor requesting that they appoint membership from -- well, do we want to note Lime Village or do we want to give them a geographic description or

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, the only resident community, I guess, is Lime, isn't it?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And I don't think they recognize individual subsistence users outside of those communities?

MR. SUMMERS: The burden of eligibility doesn't apply. In other words, the Governor or the Secretary could appoint someone that's not eligible

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay, anyway. Yeah.

MR. SUMMERS: if that makes sense. And you know, like I said, Vince has a copy of the charter to share with you, but if you look at the section on appointment authority it addresses special eligibility requirements for regional council appointees and that's where the person has to serve on a

regional council or a local advisory committee

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. SUMMERS: And be eligible in the park. And that's where the NPS eligibility subsistence requirements apply. The Governor and the Secretary -- I guess the request is that the person be knowledgeable of subsistence uses in the park.

MR. MATHEWS: But your concerns are that they utilize the area. I'm trying to look across the room here

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, that they get some representation from that area from Western Interior area to the north.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'll come up with some wording and run it by you and if it makes

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: sense to you then we'll go ahead with it. If it doesn't then we'll rewrite.

I think it's clear what you want to do, I'm just not sure what exact wording you want to go with. Lime Village or if you want to go with residents of the southern portion of Western Interior that traditionally use the northwestern part of Lake Clark, something to that effect.

MR. REAKOFF: Residents of lower Unit 19.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that would make it clearer. In case there's someone out there living that's not a resident of Lime, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. This is comparable to what happened in Denali because in Denali, again, although I'm on a regional council and I'm from the area I wasn't in a resident community from there and I didn't -- and I'm not a subsistence user of the park, so it wasn't appropriate for me to be filling

that regional council appointment. And then I ended up the Secretary of Interior appointed me because of knowledge of the area. And even the residents of Lime and Nikolai which are resident communities have problems because the ones who are currently appointed are not actually currently using the park, but they know the history of the area and so on. So it's better that they not be an official seat, but at least they've got a voice.

MR. SUMMERS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, Clarence.

MR. MATHEWS: The next one would be Bureau of Land Management. We have two districts here that may have something to share, two district representatives.

MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, the Anchorage District of BLM. And I'll keep this real brief. As I've mentioned in previous meetings the land ownership patterns in BLM are in a state of flux and will be so for sometime relative to the selections and conveyances of lands in Alaska. However, as last year I mentioned that there were some relinquishments from State selections. We've also got a considerable amount of land back from the State selections this year that fall back into the Public Federal lands status. And I'll point it out on the map the general regions where we're picking those lands back up.

Primarily you folks are familiar with the McGrath area, the south fork of the Kuskokwim and the Windy Fork. These lands in here are now basically joined together with the relinquishment so this is now a larger land block.

Also this region right down in here is probably 90 percent returned back to Federal Public lands.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is that the area around Lime?

MR. DENTON: It would be north of Lime and north of the Swift River.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. DENTON: The stuff right around Lime would be this stuff in here and most of that is still -- we're just waiting on them to see what happens.

And there are just scattered pieces through the Iditarod and George River block over here, but nothing else of much consequence. So that's all that we have in terms of relinquishments right now.

The other issue that I want to address is one is farm management and habitats relative to subsistence resources in the Anchorage District. Some of the work we've been doing over the last two years becomes very evident that probably the last 30 years the fire suppression have had rather significant impacts on moose distribution and abundance. And some of the most highly contested areas in Alaska along the YK Delta and the lower Yukon River are probably suffering the consequences of this. In the mid '50s and the late '40s there were several large burns in the Bonasila and the Stuyahok River areas and in Anvik country over there. All those have grown up to basically black spruce deserts is what I call them. And these areas, you know, are probably desperately in need of fires right now. They would also provide a source of moose moving into the Yukon River in the wintertime as a source. It would speed up the re-colonization of -- or colonization of the Yukon Delta with moose. There's options here and you folks want to take a look at those sorts of things.

The other thing is, it's becoming more and more apparent that the village corporations and the regional corporations have an extremely important role to play in managing the habitats for subsistence resources. Many, many of these areas are private lands that really have the majority of the animals on them. And currently it seems to say it's the State and it's the Feds under those umbrellas we can cover all of our needs and this is absolutely false in most areas. In most areas without actually very close attention to land use practices and actual habitat and game management concerns on those corporation lands we can jeopardize subsistence resources very significantly and in most

cases the Federal lands cannot meet the total subsistence resource needs. In fact, it would be virtually impossible.

The areas we've talked about in the last few days along the Yukon and Innoko Bottom, the majority of those moose are on basically private lands. The Kuskokwim River is where most of the subsistence harvest takes place is not Federal land. It's corporation lands and to some degree State lands. Mostly the inaccessible highlands and stuff quite some distance from the river is where the Federal public lands are. And to depend on the Federal Board and the Federal regulations to provide subsistence resources we can be kidding ourselves. We've got to take a look a whole picture and I don't think we've been doing that. And maybe this particular council can facilitate a little greater understanding with the corporations and the part that they have to play in managing subsistence resources because their responsibility is very, very significant. That's all I have. Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is there any possibility of corporations putting their land in the status that would come back under Federal rules because right now subsistence doesn't count on their lands even if they wanted to, they have to by State regulations?

MR. DENTON: That's correct. I believe there's a petition right now to the Secretary of Interior to look into that. However, the way ANILCA is written and interpreted right now is that subsistence management and activities will not interfere with State and Native selections and/or private lands. And essentially Native corporation lands are private lands basically ide- -- you know, under State law. And so Federal jurisdiction the way it's interpreted now really does not apply.

MR. MATHEWS: What he mentioned was, I believe it's the Northwest Arctic Regional Council petition. And that was asking for selected but not conveyed lands (indiscernible - background noises) need, if they've been conveyed then they're considered private.

MR. DENTON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. We discussed corporation land at our meetings that we've been having on the four villages I represent. And enforcement is a big problem, you know, on keeping hunters off of corporation land. Right now it's virtually impossible to enforce trespassing on it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You've taken action to close them, you mean

MR. HUNTINGTON: Oh, just discussion, you know. We're just looking at all kinds of solution but there is a problem of enforcement on corporation land.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do you have a comment, Angie?

MS. MORGAN: Yes. Angie Morgan, the Kuskokwim Native Association in Aniak. Just listening to what he was talking about, corporation land that this committee should start looking into the corporations' concerns and how they operate on their private lands.

I had -- when I read the proposal on that Proposal 41 for Unit 19 -- well it was Ka- -- no, Aniak, Chuathbaluk and the Paimiut to be able to hunt in Unit 18. There was a lot of mixed feelings between people from that area from Aniak area because a lot of them say, well, we've never actually gone down river to hunt because we've never had to go down there 'cause there was no moose down there. They're always coming up river to go hunting. So I think it would be a good idea if this committee would talk with the people in Aniak, Chuathbaluk and the Paimiut and find out exactly, you know, 'cause there are some people that say, well, it's good that we might be given that opportunity and yet there's other people that say, well, we've never actually gone down that way to hunt.

And then the other thing is in looking at some of these papers I saw that there was some proposal against Aniak, Chuathbaluk and the Paimiut having customary and traditional use

in Unit 18. And they also mentioned that the corporation land 'cause the Kuskokwim Corporation has a permit fee for people that come on corporation land during moose hunting season or any time during the year. And they mentioned -- I'm not really sure how it was mentioned in the proposal from Kwethluk, but to me like they have a mis-understanding that maybe if they allow these villages to have customary and traditional use in Unit 18 then the Kuskokwim Corporation would probably feel guilty and take out their 400 dollar permit that they have on non-shareholders. And I think it would be a good idea, you know, if the committee would let these people know exactly the difference corporation land, Federal land and State lands. And I think this is where it's going to bring a lot of confusion with the people.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you.

MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. It's been pointed out that most of those corporation lands, if they're conveyed they're private lands and they're under State regulations, so really we have no jurisdiction over them either in terms of what we're doing here.

MR. DENTON: One other thing, the biggest reason I'm bringing this up is because there seems to be somewhat of a division between regional corporations and their charters to whatever it may be for economic gain versus a lot of the village corporations whose aims may be somewhat in that direction but also to maintain those lifestyles. And the basic things I'm talking about are mining, timber harvest, some land uses out there that can have very long term negative effects for subsistence resources that the subsistence resources are not being taken into account in economic development relative to actually the people that live there and depend on the subsistence resources.

And probably the big glaring example is timber harvest right now that's going on on many corporation lands that are basically to maximize dollars at the expense of all other

resources. This is a real serious -- real serious thing that to some degree is already occurring in your region. Mining, access roads, these sorts of things will definitely accumulate over time and really degrade some of the things that you want to maintain for a lifestyle out here. So this as a specter of warning, I guess, more than anything else. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. I don't know what the status is on the Yukon, but there's going to be a major timber harvest on the Kuskokwim over the next few years. And it's on those corporation lands so it's out of our jurisdiction. And I don't know if the affected units are looking at how it's going to impact moose or, you know, at all. Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: The next agency would be the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, has anything to report that's a non-agenda item, they may at this time.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game. Earlier today I placed at your seats a copy of the guide/outfitter and transporter regulations that we had discussed yesterday. Also a copy of some E-mail correspondence that I got from a couple of our key people about the trapping clinics that the Department has conducted in various places. I might touch on that first.

Basically what I've been told is that, yes, we do still conduct the wolf trapping seminars. These are done in cooperation with the Alaska Trappers Association. And also one of the department biologists, Randy Zarnke in Fairbanks is our coordinator with the trappers in putting on these seminars. The word is, is that they're apparently pretty much tied to wintertime and that now the period for these sessions is apparently over with until next winter. But that would give the villagers who are interested in getting this training, give them ample time to decide what they'd like to do and contact Randy Zarnke about getting scheduled next winter sometime to bring this training to the area they want it in, to the village.

They do point out there's a fee to recover some of their expenses. I don't think it's very expensive. But at any rate

you could get all the details about that from Randy Zarnke.

From the guide/outfitter regulations I prepared a little insert that indicates that the person who is the main contact for getting information about how licenses are issued, the tests that are given to qualify guides. And the main records that are kept are in the hands of Kurt West in Juneau.

Now, the Division of Occupational Licensing does have a couple of law enforcement people to enforce these regulations that are in this blue book. There's only two of them for the whole state, so they keep pretty busy. But they're pretty dedicated fellas and they work pretty closely with the Department of Public Safety Fish & Wildlife Enforcement officers in trying to identify and put out of commission guys that are not obeying the regulations.

Within the regulations themselves there's a lot of detail, but I've listed some of the main points that you'd probably be most interested in to get started in studying all this and the pages numbers on which they're located. The guide/outfitters have quite a lot of restrictions on how they're supposed to behave and what qualifies them to be legally allowed to operate. The same thing with the transporters. And it goes on to explain in there the significance of this commercial use permit. Not only do the transporters and guide outfitters have to get one of these commercial use permits in addition to their licenses, but also people that may not be transporters or guides may also provide certain services to big game hunters that would also require having one of these commercial use permits.

So what I'm emphasizing here is that if you feel that you're having problems with anybody that seems to be a guide outfitter or a transporter or a commercial use permit person which may be somebody with a lodge or a permanent camp that caters somehow to big game hunters, the information in this booklet would tell you whether they're operating legally or not. And if you feel like there is a problem then get in touch with Gary Veras or Murph Stalder at the address or phone number indicated and explain the situation to them.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: John, do they have authority over

people who are not guides but are acting as guides as well?

MR. MORRISON: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Oh,

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: SO it isn't just the people that are already been guides

MR. MORRISON: yeah, that's one of the main sources of their action is arresting people that are taking money on the pretense of being guides or transporters

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Uh-hum.

MR. MORRISON: and are not legally qualified, however. So they make a lot of cases on that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Some of the concerns that were from Holy Cross in that area about that activity should be reported to the individual you mentioned there? Kurt West, is it?

MR. MORRISON: Kurt West is more suited to get general information about these regulations. You can get more copies of these regulation books. You can also get from him a list of the current registered guides who are registered in guide areas. Now, that's another important element here. And the regulations concerning this area registration on pages 29 to 33, this is something that came out of the new guide law that was passed in 1989 and created this big game commercial services board which has since been put out of commission by the Legislature. Nevertheless, these regulations are still being enforced by the Division of Occupational Licensing itself and will do so until the Legislature makes any other changes, but

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Who would be the contact though, for complaints if you feel there is illegal activities

MR. MORRISON: Gary Veras or Murph Stalder would be the people to talk to on that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Gary?

MR. MORRISON: Yes, it's on this

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay. They can get it off that sheet.

MR. MORRISON: Yeah. I put a copy of this in your booklet

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. Okay.

MR. MORRISON: along with this information about the wolf trapping lessons.

So, if you get some time later you can go through all this and start with these pages I've indicated and that will zero you right in on the main points, I think, you're most concerned about. And then once you've memorized all that you can branch out into the other stuff, you know.

MS. VANDERPOOL: When are we having the test?

MR. MORRISON: Ma'am?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: When's the test?

MS. VANDERPOOL: When's the test?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Next fall.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Next fall. Okay.

MR. MORRISON: Some other items that I might point out that are kind of holding the department in limbo, you might say, as far as any major changes in what we're up to or thinking about doing. One has to do with the current session of the Legislature. We're not sure what our budgets are going to look like for doing some of the things that we need to do or would like to do or have already started and ought to keep going with. There's some things in the Legislature right now about, for example, a bounty on wolves and some other things that would change the way our budget would come out. Also require us to do

certain things that we had not planned on doing. And until that's all settled we have to kind of sit back and wait and see what happens before taking on some new activities we've been thinking about.

There are also a couple of referendums that will be voted on this fall. One has to do with air borne hunting and another one has to do with taking fish away from commercial fishermen to make them more available for sport fishermen. This is particularly a big thing in the Cook Inlet area.

We're still waiting to see what comes out on this Katie John/NARC petition situation as was mentioned yesterday. The Federal Appeals Court has told the Federal agencies here in Alaska to get busy on a set of regulations to take over fish management in navigable waters within the Federal land areas.

The NARC petition requests that the Federal government take over wildlife management on land adjacent to Federal areas where there seems to be perceived an impact on the subsistence hunting on the Federal areas. That's gone to the Supreme Court in Washington. They should come out with a decision sometime this spring about whether they will hear this and act on it or not. I might add that 11 other states, western states, have signed on on this with Alaska because they're very concerned about what the Supreme Court might decide that would affect their states in this same question.

Item G on the agenda, if I could touch on that now it would save bringing it up later one as least as far as the State input is concerned.

That has to do with the proposal that Lieutenant Governor Fran Ulmer has worked on for quite awhile about an idea for trying to solve this subsistence impasse, this dual management problem that we refer to. I really can't add anything to her report. And I think you've got a copy of it in your packet that Vince handed out, it's pretty self-explanatory. There are three main situations therein that the whole situation seems to depend on. One is to get Congress to amend to ANILCA and the other to get the Legislature to change the State

Constitution. And then, there's a third element that seems pretty important about establishing another bunch of councils or committees or whatever in addition to what we've already got.

It would seem to a lot of reviewers that we've heard express an opinion about this that if any one of these three elements fails the whole thing goes down the tube. The Legislature would not fund another bunch of councils. As you well know it's expensive to operate these advisory councils. It's pretty unlikely that the Legislature would stand the State Constitution at the present with the Legislature we have, so if you do have any comments though, that you'd like to pass along to the Lieutenant Governor there's some addresses on the bottom page 5 in her document that would guide you to where you should send your comments, either as a council or as individual members. You could do it either way.

We're also in the Department somewhat holding our breath over this National Science Foundation study that the Governor has induced. The Department's coughing up about \$325,000 to pay for several experts, specialists, whatever you want to call them, from outside come in and look us over and decide whether we're doing right or not about predator control. They'll also be looking at the bear predation problem as well as wolves.

We have several cooperative projects going on in the State now that we feel pretty good about. Forty-Mile caribou herd, Mentasta caribou herd, the Kilbuck caribou herd projects. Lower Yukon moose management committee, all of these projects involve both State and Federal agencies as well as good representation from the local communities in trying to get at some of these management problems right at the beginning level and get them better understood and questions worked out well ahead of ever getting proposals or whatever elevated up to board level for any decisions. And it seems to be producing a lot better results for everybody's satisfaction.

And we have a major effort under way right now to set up another one of these cooperative projects on the Western Arctic caribou herd. And John Trent, who is biologist in the Wildlife Conservation Division is running a project on rural harvest

identification and whatever you want to call it. He has contacted several parts of the state now along the North Slope and along the west end of the state talking to groups of communities about this idea to get their feelings on it. He's now started talking to some of the Federal agencies to get their input. Once it kind of becomes clear whether or not this idea could fly on this scale it would be a big one to take in that whole area of that herd's range. We might then proceed on to a more formal attempt to get something organized.

This would offer a massive amount of opportunity for local communities to get involved in the management of that herd. Whatever it happens to be; habitat, conditions or hunting regulations, whatever, needs to be addressed we could do it on a more complete basis we feel. So John Trent will maybe be contacting you folks again about this further once we get moving along with more ideas about it.

The Wildlife Conservation Division is also looking at some other possibilities for reaching out to a wider array of people interested in wildlife. Historically the Department or Division has been pretty much concerned with the interest of sports hunters. And this incomplete in complying with the laws as well as with public opinion. There are a lot of folks in the public such as yourselves, subsistence interests, who also have a stake in how wildlife as management and harvest allocated (sic). We're under a lot of pressure anymore from the anti-hunting animal protection groups. And of course, they have their legitimate say-so about some of this. Whether you agree with them or not, nevertheless, by law they have a voice in what should be done.

So these are some of the things that we're concerned about now and education and information and analyzing what we're referring to as the human dimensions in wildlife interest. And we've conducted a couple of major surveys in recent years about how people feel about hunting, how they practice hunting, who are they and where do they do, what do they expect, what do they want the Department to do. All of these questions have been looked at and we're ready now to start trying to take some of that information and put it into our programs. So that's about

where we are right now.

As I mentioned we're sort of sitting and waiting for some of these big events to unfold before we can proceed with some of the plans that we would like to do something about, but I guess probably the main thing is going to be what the Legislature does with our budget. And not only the Wildlife Conservation Division but once again, the Subsistence Division is pretty seriously worried because of the threats to their existence. Last year the Legislature first started talking about doing away with that division entirely. They finally cut them about 25 percent. Now, this year they're saying the same thing, do away with the Division. If the cut -- if they go back to what they did before and cut another 25 percent, next year they may take another 25 percent, eventually they'll get it all evaporated. So it's hard to say what's going to happen though. But that's all I have. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. MATHEWS: John, if there's an extra copy of the guide in your inserts it'd be nice to have for the record because I think this issue is going to be back again and again.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions for John?

Thank you, John.

MR. MORRISON: You're welcome.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Not to overlook another agency, but I know that they have a longer report. Are there any other agencies like Native corporations, nonprofit Native corporations or others that would like to share at this moment some ideas with the Council that are non-agenda items?

Okay. Last but not least, Fish & Wildlife Service. You remember at the last meeting in Aniak you requested that the refuges give you a report on guided uses and any other topics they wanted to talk about, so Tom Eley will be talking about the refuges he deals with and then Tom Early will follow on the Kanuti. And yesterday you had Laura Reid for Innoko.

MR. ELEY: Thank you. Tom Eley here. I'd like to first off just comment on what Mr. Denton from BLM commented on on Native land and corporation land and the need for management activities there. That's really an important issue. I know that it may be tangential to what this board officially deals with but those that even belong to corporations I would encourage you to talk with your corporations about managing the land for subsistence purposes which may include things like prescribed fire or whatever.

In the Galena area we have a co-operative agreement with Gana-a' Yoo Corporation, it's a land bank agreement with the Gana-a' Yoo Corporation represents four villages, Nulato, Kaltag, Koyukuk and Galena. And they put about 200,000 acres of their land into a land bank agreement with us. Initially that helped protect that land in case there was some insolvency. But now it also provides the Fish & Wildlife Service with the opportunity to use our expertise, our money to do cooperative projects. And one of them as been this cooperative GIS system where they have access to the same data base that we have. We can make joint maps. They can make maps related to corporation business. We can make maps for Western Interior Regional Council or whatever, but it's a very cooperative agreement and includes a lot of other things like vegetation analysis, some prescribed fire.

There's a plan for prescribed fire on Gana-a' Yoo land near Galena. The people from Kaltag want some prescribed fire in the Kaltag area to improve moose habitat and to improve berry production. So there are opportunities out there to work cooperatively with all the agencies, not just the Fish & Wildlife Service. And I would encourage corporations to start exploring those opportunities. It can be beneficial for both of us and it brings a high degree of understanding and mutual respect and cooperation.

Let's see, what else did I miss. We spent a lot of time dealing with the issue of increased hunters as Harold as mentioned with his proposal and we talked about earlier this morning. There's great concern down in my country about the

increasing number of people coming out there and how we can regulate that. And we've tried to explain the source of legalities that we can do and what we can't do to try to work on this issue. But we have tried to work real hard over the last year with people.

One of the concerns that are always expressed from local people are wanton waste and littering then. And we consider both of these to be very high priority issues, particularly when you have 444 people coming down there and camping in about a 30 mile stretch of river or so.

Taking a person to court for a wanton waste case is very difficult. Oftentimes we'll get calls from local people and we have very good relations with our communities and people will call us and say, well, so-and-so or a person left a moose out there. Well, the information is about two weeks old and in those sorts of cases, you know, we can't do very much. We can go out there and find, yeah, sure enough, there's a moose, but you know, we don't know who was there or anything.

One of the things we've tried to do is to go out every year and identify camps. We go to each camp along the Koyukuk River up the Kateel and up the Nowitna River. Usually myself and my assistant manager or a couple of my enforcement officers and we'll stop at every camp, get names of people that are there, local people, non-local people. And then if we go back there and there's a big mess we can cite people for littering. If we find some evidence of wanton waste we have, at least, a place to start.

The other problem is once you cite someone for wanton waste cases you have to get them to the court system. And what we do with most of our wanton waste cases is we turn it over to the State Troopers and have them process it through State law because the opportunity for prosecution or at least the penalties are going to be higher than under Federal law. Unfortunately, we've had a few problems with magistrates that think that's a less than important issue even though a lot of local people are concerned about it. I always encourage local people although I don't lobby now 'cause I don't want to get

across the line here, but you know, if you have a chance to talk to magistrates or judges you might tell them what your feelings are about seriousness of things like wanton waste.

We did cite quite a few people this year for littering. That's a 250 dollar fine. The bulk of them were non-local people, but we did have two local people that got cited for littering, so I know that's a concern and we're taking care of it.

Another thing that's going on, I've got a brand new biologist that's working for me who was raised in the Galena area, Orville Huntington. He went away to college, got his Bachelors in Wildlife and now he's back working for me as a biologist. He's going to focus on moose and wolf issues. And he did a lot of the analysis for the proposal we had today. And you'll be seeing him at these meetings in the future.

I would encourage you to contact the refuge if you have questions about our area. And of course, this probably pertains to Harold and William the most, but if you have questions I know that we'd be glad to come out and talk with people about biological issues or law enforcement issues or land management issues, fire management or whatever. That's what we're there for, so don't hesitate to call on us. And I know Tom Early would go up to Allakaket, too, if necessary.

We have our wolf census that I talked about yesterday. It's still on hold. We got a little bit of snow overnight, but not enough to get going, but we're still waiting with five airplanes, five eager pilots and five eager observers to jump in and fly around the air. When we get some information on that, certainly within the next meeting we'll be glad to report on it assuming that we get it done.

The other question that came up last time and I wasn't at the meeting, but it had to do with guides. And I made you a handout for guides in the -- my refuge area. And if you turn to the second page as soon as you get it, we have on the Koyukuk Refuge and the upper unit of the Innoko, we have six guide areas. Four of those guide areas are being utilized by guides.

One guide has one area and one guide has three areas.

Area #1 which is down at the bottom of the map which is the Kaiyuh Flats and Area #2 which is above that does not have a guide. Neither one of those areas. Both of those are closed to Koyukuk Village and Galena and Nulato and Kaltag, so I've asked our regional office that in the future to not offer these guide areas for availability. I would rather see them not have a guide in those particular areas because I know there's concern certainly from Kaltag, Nulato and Koyukuk about guiding and particularly on the Kaiyuh Flats. Thus far the regional office has been very receptive to that idea, so I don't think we'll have guides out there for the near future. I guess someone could take us to court over it and that might happen, I suppose, when the next round of bids go out, but I don't think we need guides there. I think the opportunities are available in other areas.

On the front page you can see the guides, the two different guides we have and the number of animals, the number of clients they've taken. Virgil Umphenour is one of our guides and he guides in a cooperative agreement. And I don't know the particulars of it and I know it's a little bit controversial, but with Huslia Village, a lot of the assistant guides, as you can see, are from Huslia.

And then, Brian Simpson is our other guide in Tiaga (ph) hunting. He's from Eagle but he guides mostly -- my guess is most of his guiding is off the refuge and actually up on BLM land way up the Hog River and up in that country, but he claims that he's taken this many on the refuge, but I suspect that most of them were taken off the refuge. I don't think he exactly knows where the boundary is very well. It's, again, one of those sort of nebulous places of where you're in the refuge and where you're out of the refuge, but fortunately the regulations between BLM and us are pretty similar.

On the Nowitna Refuge we only have one guide, Alex Tarnai. He guides for all three areas on the Nowitna. He also does sport fish guiding, river rafting and he sort of does it almost as an avocation rather than a job. He takes clients out if he wants to and if he doesn't want to he doesn't. He takes a

lot of Japanese tourists out in the summertime in kayaking trips and they do some pike fishing. And sort of has a lot of fun. We were out there and met him one day and he had two honeymoon couples there on the Nowitna. I don't know if it's a real romantic spot, but there's sure a lot of mosquitos there to be very romantic, but

And then, we have one other guide that guides for sport fish in the Nowitna, Don Duncan. He's also a game guide but up in the Kanuti country. And I think he brought one boat of clients out and I think they took home one fish or something. It's mainly catch and release.

We have a couple of air taxis that fly into the Nowitna. One comes from Lake Minchumina and one is Willow Air that Laura Reid was mentioning yesterday. Willow had some problems this year, but it's under new management and they didn't understand the rules and regulations and I think they do now, but -- and then we have another guide called Ptarmigan Air and he does a lot of flying in and out of Galena mainly up north. But remember that up on the Koyukuk there we have the control use area where there's no fly-ins. And most of his clients are either above the control use area. Apparently they go in in rafts and then raft down the river and come out somewhere or another. And we've followed him pretty closely to see if he was, in fact, dropping people in the control use areas. And he's actually a pretty skookum guy. He had a client last year that was involved in a very gross wanton waste case and he tells them up front, you know, you leave the meat out there I'm turning you in, you know. If you don't like it don't fly with me. He's a real good outfitter -- or a good transporter and this gentleman was prosecuted but, unfortunately, the magistrate didn't like the case and threw it out. So

And that's about what's going on with us. Questions?

MR. REAKOFF: It's a high priority these wanton waste cases and you keep reiterating that these magistrates keep throwing these cases out of court.

MR. ELEY: I won't speak for all magistrates, but I'll

speak for at least one.

MR. REAKOFF: And that's the magistrate in Galena or

MR. ELEY: In that part of the world, yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: I would like to get more information about this. This seems to be a glitch in the enforcement problem here.

MR. ELEY: Well, I mentioned it to the Galena folks and the folks in our country so when they talk to him, you know, maybe it would come better from non-Fed. He doesn't like the Federal government very well, but that's beside the point.

But I think if local people just remind their magistrates and even their VPSOs who have the authority to enforce some of these laws, too, that this is something that we're concerned about. And of course, we need to tell people, too, that this is something that we're concerned about and we're taking a lot of action in looking for this. It's not always evident. And then sometimes local people will feel like, jimminy, you know, why are they in my camp. Well, we go to everybody's camp because we want to be fair and equitable. And generally visits to camps are really pleasant times, but it's really important for local people to stress to their people in their law enforcement chain of command that they feel that this is important and should be taking action.

You know, it's not just me or other people who've expressed it to the magistrate what we think, you know. But other people have got to let him know or her know this is what our expectations are. We think this is a real problem. We want you to deal with this as severely as possible. It's worked in other areas. And I think local people need to be more involved in that. Sometimes they're not comfortable with that, but the same way, we've got a very good relationship with the villages. We've had good luck with people contacting us with law enforcement issues both from local people and non-local people that have caused problems. And we try to deal with those as

fairly and as fast. And the sooner the people can let us know the better case we can make and the better chance we have of getting it through the magistrate, but again when it's a case that's a week or two weeks old, you know, it's really hard to nail down. But it is frustrating when you get a really good case, a really egregious case and you run it in there and they say, well, you can't hunt for five years in Alaska, you know. Fine, I'm from California, you know.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, I have a question.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, Harold had a question.

MR. ELEY: Yeah.

MR. HUNTINGTON: How do you find out how much hunters are flying in when you don't have a checkpoint?

MR. ELEY: Well, during the hunting season we have Paul Liedburg out flying around. We also have special agents from Fairbanks out looking for airplanes.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Uh-hum.

MR. ELEY: And I might mention that we do have a couple of people that we suspect have been flying in and we've tried to catch them. We know -- or we think there's a guide that's sort of working illegally. There's certainly probably at least one or two transporters that are working illegally. And we've tried to work those individuals and see if we could catch them, but we haven't yet. But we have people out flying around looking as well as out in the boats.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Uh-hum.

MR. ELEY: On the Nowitna we do have a check station, but it's not a mandatory check station like the one is on the Koyukuk. It's possible for people to fly in. It's possible for people to fly above like up the Kateel and then float in that way and -- but then they'd have to float on down. But it is something we watch for and it's not easy to tell, too.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, I think it's becoming a big problem this last three or four years to fly in people, you know, they've probably quadrupled since, you know, three or four years ago. And there never used to be people coming in to Koyukuk, to the village of Koyukuk, you know, and now they're coming in there and

MR. ELEY: Uh-hum.

MR. HUNTINGTON: loading up and

MR. ELEY: Remember, that's right on the boundary of the control use area,

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

MR. ELEY: so you could fly in to some of those areas. You could fly in to the Kaiyuh Flats and there's a proposal before the Game Board to extend the control use area out and cover the Kaiyuh Flats which I think would solve a lot of that, but there are some people that fly into the Kaiyuh Flats.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think a lot of this flying is going in unchecked though and it should be a little more -- you know, a little more control to it

MR. ELEY: Yeah, I agree. That's just a hard one to find, you know. There's only a limited amount of people, limited amount of time and it's a big country out there.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. You know, I agree with a lot of things you've been doing and I think it's made an impact on the area and you've gained, you know. When Fish & Wildlife first moved into Galena, you know, there was a lot of people that, you know, didn't like the Fish & Wildlife at all

MR. ELEY: Uh-hum.

MR. HUNTINGTON; because maybe 30 years ago they

were pretty hard on some of them, and you know, that attitude has changed and I got to see it

MR. ELEY: Yeah.

MR. HUNTINGTON: and I think you're doing a good job. Thanks.

MR. ELEY: Thanks, Harold.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Anybody else? Thank you.

MR. ELEY: Yes, sir.

MR. MATHEWS: The next presenter will be Tom Early for Kanuti Wildlife Refuge.

MR. EARLY: I'm Tom Early, manager of Kanuti Refuge, not to be confused with the other Tom.

Kanuti, what I'd like to do is start out and talk a little bit about our guide/outfitters and air taxi operators using the refuge and then talk a little bit about other projects we have going on in Kanuti.

First of all, on Kanuti Refuge, about two-thirds of the refuge is covered by the Kanuti controlled use area. I'll show you that on this overhead. Kanuti Refuge is this area here and the controlled use area pretty much covers the western two-thirds. I'll just leave that on for awhile.

On that controlled use area it applies only to moose. And as most controlled use areas are access by aircraft. And, you know, on the Kanuti controlled use area it also restricts non-residents of Game Management Unit 24 for the most part access to that area, too. So we don't have near the amount of hunting pressure and accessibility, I guess, as other areas do like the Koyukuk Refuge.

We have one area set up for a guide. And that guide is Don Duncan. And he has a permit on the refuge since 1993. And

he has not utilized the permit. He has had no clients on the refuge. He operates south of the refuge for the most part, and he has had a couple of hunts lined up on the southern end of the refuge outside the controlled use area, but he has not activated nor really fulfilled any of those clients or those clients backed out. So we have not had any take by the guide on Kanuti Refuge.

I'm not real sure how long he's going to be operating there. I think it's questionable as to whether or not he's going to try it again this year, so we may be -- we may not have a guide, at least, Don Duncan for this next coming year possibly.

We have several air taxi operators that utilize the refuge, both of them from Bettles. Brooks Range Aviation this year got a permit from us, but they took no clients out so there was no one that was on the refuge from that air taxi operator. Bettles Lodge also has a air taxi operator permit. They took two hunters out and there were two moose taken from the southern end of the refuge on their permit.

We have one outfitter that utilizes the refuge and that's Sourdough Outfitters out of Bettles. They mainly go north of Bettles into Gates of the Arctic and the areas in the Brooks Range, but they did take -- let's see, in the past they have taken people on the refuge mainly for -- they took a float trip on one year and they are discussing taking more sled dog trips, I think, as a potential. They're increasing their operations there in the wintertime quite a bit, but this last year they did not utilize their permit on the refuge either. Similar to that one air taxi operator. So, kind of in a nutshell there's not a lot of use by commercial guides, outfitters on the refuge for clients nor are there a lot of non-resident hunters that go into the area also.

The rivers that flow into the refuge are long and fairly shallow and/or real rough and hard to get to, hard to get out of, and there just isn't a lot of people that go in and take any large game from the refuge.

We do have an interested party that showed some interest this -- well, several weeks ago to float -- have some commercial float trips on the Kanuti River on the south end of the refuge coming in from the Dalton Highway. Whether or not they will request a special use permit I am uncertain, but that permit or at least that request is being tossed about right now.

I don't know if there's any questions on guides, outfitters, air taxi operators on Kanuti. Again, just in a summary it's very limited use. If not I'll go on just quickly to some of our other projects.

As Tom Eley was stating, we're working on trying to get some wolf population figures this spring also. And as I stated yesterday we're on hold because of the snow conditions right now. We would like to do some flying up there if there is sufficient snow this year and have some figures available for you on some wolf populations or estimates for populations on wolf.

Our last moose census was conducted in 1993. We planned to do another one in 1998, which is a five year span there. And in between times we really haven't done nor intend to do unless things really change or show some indication of a change in the population of any trend counts either. But the '93 census which was pretty accurate statistically did show a pretty good increase from the 1989 census. And we have no reason to believe that moose populations are changing drastically from that.

We also do small mammal trapping, mainly post-fire. We have a lot of fires on the refuge in 1990, '91 and '93 we had some. And about half the refuge burned really. And we're checking small mammal populations as these are basically the prey base for larger fur bearers and trying to get an idea of what the prey base is available for the larger fur bearers including wolf, lynx, et cetera.

We also have vegetation surveys and long term plots as well as water quality areas that we're checking and changes there following the fire.

We conducted through the help of local people, local villages from Allakaket water fowl collections last spring with Barry Whitehill, the assistant, checking -- well, we collected some water fowl that were commonly taken during the spring season and sent them to the University of Connecticut to do some contaminant studies on those. And to date we don't have any hard figures back. We've been calling the fella and trying to get some information on that. And I've know we've got a lot of interest from the villagers on the contaminants in these water fowl and right now we don't have any hard figures for you. We also collected some in August also to get a baseline of the resident populations.

We plan to have a meeting in Allakaket on the 29th. We've checked that through the Village Council and we will be talking more out to the villages on the 29th of March and talking about some projects we plan to do on the refuge at that time also. Kind of in a nutshell that's what we're looking at on Kanuti. We've got a pretty small staff, we lost a biologist about a year and a half ago I believe and have not been able to refill that position due to budget cuts and other priorities. And so we're a happy crew, but small. Any questions.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Small, who do you have, what do you have?

MR. EARLY: We have a biologist/pilot and that's the only biologist full-time permanent pilot -- or biologist that we have but she is also a pilot and a biologist so it's about 50/50 there. And then we have an assistant manager and then we have a term position in Bettles that lives in Bettles and her term expires, I think, next April and we would hope to possibly be able to refill that position in the future too when that term does expire. And we also have an administrative assistant in Fairbanks. We only have one person right now in Bettles.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you. Previously you were studying mercury contamination in pike, I was wondering what the status of that was.

MR. EARLY: Yeah, some of the preliminary results we got back about four years ago I think it was from some -- from some real quick surveys they did and it was mainly on the south fork of the Koyukuk River. It showed some real high concentrations of mercury. But that -- the readings on those apparently was erroneous or at least, I think the readings were okay, but the interpretations of the readings was wrong. And as it turned out, the mercury content in the muscle tissues of the pike were just slightly above normal, it was within acceptable limits of the FDA, so there really is not a problem at this point. Right now we're -- they have put out a report on all of those samplings that we did from about '85, I think, until about 1990 or something like that. And what -- if funds become available, is possibly do some more select site studies or select species studies, but there isn't a real high priority for that because on the preliminary indications that they have conducted, it really didn't show a high need or a risk.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Was the source natural background in the stream system?

MR. EARLY: Well, that's -- it's kind of an unknown. There was mining activities that took place in the late 1800s, you know, like a lot of these areas, the south fork was a real big one and then I think up to the Gold Bench area on the north end of the south fork, I don't know when that was active for sure but that was a big site also.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. And the priorities, sometimes they mine in there.

MR. EARLY: Okay. So it may be some left over from that and just the spoils, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Are you doing background water quality studies on your streams out there?

MR. EARLY: Mainly it's on the lakes is what we're doing and the water quality is mainly related to nutrients. And the -- not the cycle of nutrients, but the amount of nutrients and

the type of nutrients that exist following a fire and then the changes and, you know, the kick of nitrogen that comes into the system and maybe some of the impacts there following the fire.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you. Any questions?

MR. EARLY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Does that conclude the reports then?

MR. MATHEWS: That's all the reports that I know of.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Let's take a 10 minute break and then come back and finish.

MR. SIMON: Can I make few comments?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Sure, sure, in response to the reports?

MR. SIMON: Yes. I'd like to make a few comments which is not really on the agenda, but I'd like to make a few comments on fighting forest fires in Alaska and the Lower 48 I'll bring up to you because different agencies might be just for fighting fires or something like that. So I'll make a few comments. I've been fighting fire off and on for the last 35 years and we used to make money and have fun doing it. Sometimes -- most of the time fighting fire in the village is the only source of income and sometimes an individual would make 5,000 but more regulations and restrictions, things have changed. I don't know if to save money or not, but fires are sort of left burn and there are more other restrictions and taking step tests like last year it was June 8 since Mike (indiscernible) took over and care of Alaska from Fairbanks office more restriction came. Before that time step test were open in the field through the 15th, but Mike he come out on June 8 like he did last year, if you missed the step testing, that's it you wouldn't get another chance. This restriction I don't like because often times other villages only -- if they never pass the step test there's no work for them. And I'd like to see them give more chances to take step test.

Then the last few years there have been a lot fires burn around Allakaket and there was one fire on Double Point and it was small in the spring time, but it burned all summer long and in September we ended up fighting it for three weeks and they let it go to save money, but I don't think they saved any money on this one since most the elders and children were flown to Ft. Wainwright for two weeks in twin otters. I'm a crew boss for the last few years so I have spring training every spring. And Mike, he will give us a tour if he's in Station 4 -- stationed in Fairbanks. And they have a room, I see a lot of equipments, they can trace the lighting, they can tell how many lightings strike in a given day and if it hit the ground they can tell it just by sitting down and looking at the computer. And if there's a fire start it can come out on the computer too, and what they do is they fly out and watch the fire, monitor the fire for a few days. They just about do anything with the fire except fight it. And up to this point a lot of money has been spent just for -- from the urban center for this, no villagers involved. And I just want to bring this up because a lot of us are -- in the village we used to make money fighting fire but there's a lot of restrictions and new rules we couldn't do it anymore.

I just want to -- I'm not directing my comments or questions at any individual, but I just want to bring this up. Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any response Jeff?

MR. DENTON: I'm probably not exactly the most appropriate person because the Alaska Fire Center is the ones that get those budgets and ramrod that situation. But I fought fire on and off for 25 years, I'm an incident commander and I'm a prescribed fire boss so I've been around the fire show for a long, long time. The fire organizations across the United States are like all the rest of the Federal agencies coming into tremendous financial difficulties, budgets aren't there. We've also come under a lot of liabilities in terms of -- because of some rather large scale mortalities of firefighters and this goes back somewhat to the step test thing and some of the

tightening of those sorts of things because we lost a lot of people here in the last couple of years that were, you know, killed on fires. And those become -- those are taken extremely seriously. And many, many actions are being taken this day and age, first of all, to save money, secondly, it's been recognized finally over the last 50 years, some of our fire suppression policies and activities have actually done more damage to the eco-system than good. It's not always necessary the best thing to put the fires out.

My recommendation to most folks in the villages is that many of these crews could be used much more effectively with proper training to do prescribe fire to actually make fire breaks and modify the vegetation within a certain distance of the villages as a very active annual type process that would better use, actually the crews, to protect the villages from large scale disaster fires. And I've been talking to the Alaska Fire Center, Scott Billings, up there regarding this. I think there -- these are changing times in fire management and we're going to have to make some adjustments and see what we can do pro-active wise to both benefit villages from the standpoint of being protected from fire and also potentially utilizing the personnel that are in those villages.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Let's take a break, 10 minutes, then come back and finish.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Back into session. And the next item under discussion is the Regional Charter Review and Approval.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. For the Council members, the charter material that's under Tab 8 and following the materials explaining the regional charters, which I won't go into detail, is your actual charter that was signed -- well, it was signed on January 31st, 1995. The charter is what sets up this organization, it makes the requirements, it makes you bound to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. There -- this charter as

comparison to the subsistence resource commission is a two year review of it. I mean every two years it comes up for review and signature. What you can change on your charter is you can go -- you can request a name change, a boundary change, the size of the regional council membership and I'll come back to that, specific subsistence resource commission appointments and criteria for removing a member. There are items that are set in regulation and that's the objectives and scope of the activity, duration of the charter.

So under this there's two things that we need to look at based on your past actions. One, is the size of regional council memberships. I think we approached this council either last meeting or the meeting before asking on adequacy of geographic representation, did you feel there was the right number of members where the areas being represented, your response was yes, but you were very uncomfortable taking actions on areas that the representative for that area within your region was not present. So you floated out the idea and pushed the idea of having alternates. And there was a brief discussion, not a great detail on, like having two alternates, one from the northern part of the region and one from the southern part of the region, where the north and south was, there was no discussion on that. That -- well, anyway, there was that discussion.

The other one that we may not want to discuss now but I want to put some seeds in your mind is the criteria for removing a member. I think we may want to look at that down the road in bylaws or whichever way we want to go on how to deal with that. We have no problem members now, we have no situations that are requiring action, but we may just want to look at that. With that, I think I'm just putting out that in the future that maybe you would look at having myself or a subcommittee of this group start drafting criteria for removing a member. So it's in -- it's clear to everybody before you have a problem, okay, so think about that. Because once you start having a problem it gets real sticky.

Okay, the -- your request for alternate members was part of a request from other councils asking for additional members.

That was presented to the board, the board took no actions on your alternate requests, but it did agree to adding to additional members and I only remember one council, but I think there were two that asked for them, Kodiak Aleutian Islands and Yukon Kuskokwim Delta both asked for additional seats and got permission to do that. Your alternate one there was no decision made on it. So that window was not -- you didn't get a positive response on or actually really any response on, so now if you want to continue with your alternate request would be to say in your charter you wanted change to have that you'd have alternate members, okay.

And that's where we stand with the charter. So if you want to go through a name change, a boundary change, size of membership and the other.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Comments?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I feel that we should resubmit the alternate proposal for the alternate for the north and south portion of the western interior where those -- to replace those members that can't make it because it's such a large area, we need that input, north and south of the Yukon or something.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Comments on that, let's see where we're at before we take a motion and see maybe -- yes, Harold.

MR. HUNTINGTON: There was a problem about two years ago, I guess, when we had several in the quorum for a meeting and so this came up and we discussed it. But it didn't seem to be that much of a problem anymore, at least not to me. But it's good to have an alternate, you know, in case, we've been having a little problem trying to get everybody together, come up with some kind of alternate within the region, I guess, you know. In case there's like -- like this meeting here, we could have had someone replacing Herman Morgan and Henry Deacon, you know. But I think we should probably try and get at least one alternate anyway.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It's pretty balanced now. Like at this meeting, for instance, at least we have Gail here from down in that area, you know, and Angela's from fairly close to Henry, so we're pretty well covered in the area.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. That's not much of a problem right now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I appreciate the attendance because it's been good I think the last couple of meetings, we're getting good attendance.

MR. HUNTINGTON: And there is a lot of people that's, you know, interested in getting on the board too.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. HUNTINGTON: And when they ask you, you know, how's the meeting going and you say, well, we didn't have a quorum they're sitting there wondering how come, you know, we're having a hard time getting a quorum, explaining somewhere along the line.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Just to make it clear to everybody because sometimes there's confusion over this. The alternates would still be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The same procedure, yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Because if someone of you with the advisory committees or other groups, you could appoint your own alternate, but that's not the case here.

MR. HUNTINGTON: It would be nice though.

MR. MATHEWS: So it's up to you if you want to push -- push forward with that. You know, you're all very busy people, as I know when I call you, the plus would be to have an alternate. The alternate, though, to cover that huge area would

-- if I was an alternate, boy I'd take a lot of aspirin before I came because I'd be really under pressure for the whole area. So if this gets approval, what I will recommend is that that alternate be trained, et cetera, in at least attend one meeting out of your annual two otherwise we'll have to just practice up on our CPR and you have to be serious because your issues are getting more complex. And if we take on fisheries, we'll all look into CPR, you know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: There is a problem with continuity. What it would do though, if there was that, I assume the appointments would be made from people that are turning in nominations anyhow and it would give them some training and experience to fill seats when they become available. So there would be kind of -- but there would be a problem of bringing them up to speed if they haven't been there of having to come in and speak to an issue then when they've had no background on it.

MS. VANDERPOOL: But if they were to attend a meeting then they would get a better feel for that. Plus, with your alternate, you know, you never know if something's going to happen or somebody's going to resign or something, then you won't have an open seat.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, that I can address. When we go through the ranking process we might end up with candidates of a high score down to a low score, so those that are appointed by the Secretary, let's say for reasons resigns or whatever, then we just go down the ranking and make a recommendation. That's -- I hope my memory's right because it's in the afternoon, but that's how we -- that's how you were appointed, Gail, is your ranking.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: So that is still in there with vacancies. This is separate of that.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: The other thing that just -- we did it

yesterday, if there was an issue -- an issue in the future that came up, we could work the phone lines if it's in an area that's well defined enough like we did, Grayling and Holy Cross and Mountain Village, we had them here on line. So that's another way of doing it. Lead time on that is needed and I can't count how many times I've called those communities to get that -- because the convention in Fairbanks through a lot of people off.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, we did get pretty broad participation, I was pleased with that.

MR. MATHEWS: I was very -- very impressed.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Because there was two or three in each community.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative) It was a good response.

MR. MATHEWS: So the issue is, do you want to continue with your alternate idea or do you want to just pause and wait?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think I'd just go with what we are now, go with the process on the board and go down the list if there's an opening or if somebody resigns just look at the list at the next one.

MR. MATHEWS: So the feelings are is just to not add anything to the charter at this time?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Because one of the reasons I think it's becoming more political, you know, we're getting the politicians in here now and it's -- it's pretty hard to keep them out once they're in.

MR. SIMON: Both members there -- if the alternate went to one meeting and is trained -- but then they can't miss more meetings, then if they go to school board meetings far away, then they wouldn't know what's happening in the previous meetings. You would have to retrain them again.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. That is the downfall of it.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I think that's probably right. But I think that working on another category of removal of a member that -- if we had a member that didn't attend and started to through a real glitch in our quorum, then I think Vince is right, that there should be a criteria for removal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So there is, in here, it says, two consecutive meetings the Chair of the Federal board may do it, but I -- and I assume we could write to him, but that isn't in the process. I don't know what triggers it, he's just looking at our minutes or is he going to wait for recommendation.

MR. MATHEWS: No, you would have to make a recommendation to him.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: That's one component of it. We have not had it, but it is a potential of having people attend the meeting that are not able to address the issues at hand. That really can cause the process to fall apart.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You mean somebody that does get appointed that just doesn't seem to have the knowledge or what are you.....

MR. MATHEWS: No.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS:saying?

MR. MATHEWS: Abuse of use of different -- alcohol or et cetera. So that's why I don't want to.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS:talk too much about it. But it really -- other employment I've had with other groups it's really difficult to deal with when you have that happen because the integrity of the group, integrity of the users and all that are questioned then by others that are really wanting to attack the process. That's kind of what I'm getting at, is that some of that needs to be addressed. The -- what is it considered, two meetings missing, excused, unexcused, what are those meanings? I know my failing is I'm more of a detail person, but, you know, you missed two meetings and you feel that they're excused, other members -- this Council's not that way, but they could be split, they could say, well, I don't think that's an excused absence, you know, going to work or something like that is not excused. I took off from, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, those kind of things soon we're going to have to start addressing. If we don't then people can make their own and then when you're at that stage, it's high stakes poker in my opinion. And I'm just saying we need to look ahead. I don't think in this Council we'll ever have that problem, but it wouldn't be bad to have as a back up that's clear to everybody, excused absence is this or whatever.

So I don't have any of that flushed out, I'm just kind of saying that we have now -- if this charter is passed we have two years to work on that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Two years.

MR. MATHEWS: You know, it's just something to think of. This Council's not a problem, all the other councils I work with are not a problem, but it does surface and it would be nice to have something more than just two meetings.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I think part of it's taking care of itself, because what I've observed is that boards are becoming more mature around the State. I mean people are getting more experience and kind of a self-policing. You know, early on when there was school board meetings or whatever there was more -- people would come to the meeting then they'd be off shopping or whatever, things like that, but I certainly haven't seen that in recent years and on this board I haven't seen that.

It's been good participation and people come to the meetings.

So I don't know whether we have to try to anticipate the problems or have them in the charter or whether you leave it as is if there isn't a problem.

Comments?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Vince, were you saying something to the effect maybe that if we had like a subcommittee from this Council here just to look -- go over this?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. That's kind of what I was looking at. And I'm not familiar, you'd have to talk to some of our more wizards on this as to what power we have under bylaws versus charter and et cetera. I think Ray is correct and I would support that highly, if it's self-regulating that's the best way to go.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: But when you lose that self regulation then you end up hitting at least three parties, the agency that's funding it with two parties -- or two or more parties that disagree and that's not pleasant.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: Because those people that are in question are representing an area and that area wants that representation, so that is threatened and it spins in a lot of directions when that takes off. We've not had that problem with this program.....

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS:and I don't envision it, but it's

something to think about. But again, if it's self-regulating -- a lot of it falls on the chair and the officers really on that. Because if someone gets out of line in a break or something like that, the chair or other officers kind of say, well, I don't understand what you're saying or we're getting a little off base here.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: But you have a real rough chair here so I'm not.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You're saying I need to bring a big stick or something?

MR. MATHEWS: A big stick and little voice or little voice from the big -- I don't know. Maybe if that seed could be just thought about or if you guys want to look at a subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, what isn't spelled out is that the council would make a recommendation to the Federal. I think if we have that authority, I suppose if we see that it's a problem, we would have to be mature enough to say, we're concerned about the attendance of this member and recommend to that board that they take some action to replace or something.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's kind of hard because we have to police ourselves, but I think we should be mature enough to do that if we see it's a real problem.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And I don't -- you know, I certainly haven't seen it in the last two meetings. I think we've got a good responsible group and attendance seems to be high. We're you going to suggest, Gail, that we have a subcommittee look into it you mean?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Well, I think that would be kind of a good idea just.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MS. VANDERPOOL:just, you know, knowing that we have that already backed and whatnot or you know what I mean? I mean it's just -- I mean I see where Vince is coming from, yeah. I don't know, I think it would be good to have just like a subcommittee look at -- look over these and look over the charters and report it to the board and whatever -- or to -- with Vince and something, work with Vince on that. I think that would be an excellent idea just to be professional.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, what is the time line? You said that this is open, does there have to be something that goes to the board this time or could it be done in the fall or what are we looking at here?

MR. MATHEWS: This is going to be prepared and needs to be signed before your fall meetings.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: So we wouldn't be able to -- well, let me back that up. We -- no, we couldn't. Because if you needed to vote on it you have to be in public session.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: So we wouldn't be able to pull it off before this round unless you asked for a special meeting on this. And I don't know if there'd be much support for a special meeting under the feeling that you have this one avenue, but it's not clear to you how that avenue proceeds. So it would be the next time the charter would come up. The other thing the subcommittee would look at is how to bylaws fit into all this. And I'd have to do some investigation on how that falls in, too.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What's your wishes?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Do I get three?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Do I get three?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You get three, do you want to try again do you mean? Three wishes. You can have more than that if you want, I'm not saying they'll be answered.

MR. MATHEWS: All right, then.....

MS. VANDERPOOL: I'm going home.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, we're getting late here.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Go ahead.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I would like to see a subcommittee on this.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. With the understanding that we won't be able to attack this.....

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS:because there isn't time.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Is there a problem having a telephone conference just on that subject?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure, you could have a motion if that's what I understand you're saying.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Because you need members on the subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And we need to make appointments.

MR. MATHEWS: And then it would mainly be by phone calls and teleconference.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: So is that your motion.

MS. VANDERPOOL: What?

MR. REAKOFF: Is that your motion?

MS. VANDERPOOL: That's my motion.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. The subcommittee will be committed.....

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS:to look at these and in order to be better prepared for what, I guess, two years from now?

MS. VANDERPOOL: You, you never know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: You have to be optimistic.

MR. REAKOFF: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, moved by Gail, seconded by Jack that a subcommittee be appointed to look into future bylaw changes and/or bylaws development. Discussion on that motion?

MR. HUNTINGTON: You got a second?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It's been seconded already, Jack seconded. Okay, all those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, three members be reasonable?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think and you don't want a quorum and that -- if you get too many.....

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All right. I guess this Chair, if I'm supposed to appoint, I'd appoint Gail as one, who else is interested?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Do you want my middle name, too?

MR. REAKOFF: I'll.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, Jack, we've got two, is there one more for phone -- who's interested.....

MR. MATHEWS: We have two members.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Harold?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, we got three. Very good.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, thank you.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And I'll leave it up to you, you guys can meet and choose a chair if you want and proceed however you want with this. You'd have to arrange for -- if you're meeting audio-conference you'd have to arrange through Vince, if it's just a matter of phone calls.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: I think what I can promise, I can't give

you a date, is the background of where we're at with removal of members and where we have removed members without their names so you can see where we have had this and see how other regions have handled this.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum. (Affirmative) That would be a good start.

MR. MATHEWS: And then from there we can explore.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. That takes care of the charter.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, the next item is one that Greg Bos is going to talk about. It's another one of those seeds in the mind idea and that's Item E, which is discussion of level of involvement of local State Fish & Game advisory committees with the regional council.

MR. BOS: Hello, I'm Greg Bos with the subsistence management staff. I know your meeting is winding down and our collective energy levels are getting low but if you'll bear with me for just a few minutes maybe we can get through this. The reason this topic of an advisory committee involvement is here is that the staff wanted to get a sense of how you feel about the participation of advisory committees and the regional council process, the value you place on that involvement to the extent it occurs now and whether it should or can be improved.

Let me give you a little background, Title VII sets out that advisory committees -- local advisory committees would be used to advise and assist the regional councils in the councils performing their functions. Congress evidently believe that local advisory committees were an important resource for the regional councils. In Title VIII it sets out that the Secretary shall establish Federal local advisory committees if he were to find that the existing advisory committee system was inadequate to perform those functions. At the beginning of the Federal program, the Federal staff, in the process of scoping the Federal program for environmental impact assessment reviewed the State's regulatory system, both the regulations themselves as

well as the advisory committee and State regional council system that was in place at that time. And the conclusion of that review is that the regional council that the State had in place were not adequate, were not performing adequately to fulfill the requirements of Title VIII, but that the local Fish & Game advisory committees generally were performing adequately and satisfied the requirements.

Now, the interaction between local advisory committees and the regional councils is different in different regions of the State. A number of committees, their level of activity, the issues that they're interested in differ. In some cases, there are Federal regional council members that are members of advisory committees and provide some linkages and I believe several of you are members of local advisory committees. And in some areas advisory committee members have participated in the regional council deliberations and have also participated in management planning efforts that have involved both State and Federal agencies and local subsistence users.

What we would like to do is at the fall regional council meetings discuss more fully the potential role of advisory committees in the regional council system. We'd like to be able to review with you the number of local advisory committees, their areas of jurisdiction, vis-a-vis, the Federal regional councils. We'd like to compare the annual schedules, schedule events so the State and the Federal regulatory processes, opportunities for cross coordination between the two and examine possible limitations at FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act might place on the participation of Fish & Game advisory committees within the regional council process and lay out several alternatives, which I think would be subject to the availability of Federal staff and funds.

Like one extreme there would be minimal involvement of Fish & Game advisory committees except to the extent that the State itself felt compelled to participate in the public process at the regional council's offer. But there would not be any Federal support and little effort by Federal staff to try to improve the coordination between the two systems. On the other extreme, there would be full participation by the councils with

Federal funding support. For example, they would participate in submitting proposals and reviewing proposals and making recommendations to the regional councils, possibly sending a chairman of each advisory committee to the council meetings to sit with you and assist you in your deliberations. This meeting I sat through yesterday when you were talking about Proposals 45 and 46 and the thought struck me there that if you'd had the G.A.S.H. advisory committee had -- you could have had input from that and perhaps had a broader representation of individuals from those communities and the individuals that you had on your teleconference.

I think before the subsistence management staff launches into this kind of a review, again, we want to have a sense of how you feel what the value of the advisory committee system is. Do you have ideas or concerns that you'd like to express at this time so that we can address those when we do a review this summer and prepare a report to the councils?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm on the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and when our -- I think it was November meeting -- when there was a point on our agenda for the Federal -- any Federal reports and there was no Federal people present. And they looked at Pollock and I to sort of fill in the blanks on anything we knew about the Federal system. But I think that the advisory committee system could work really easily and economically in conjunction with the regional council if the nearest Federal lands agency to the council -- to the committee meeting was sent one representative to represent the Federal as far as if it was near or a park, a park representative, if it was near a refuge, it would be a refuge representative would be the most economical. And then make a presentation to the committee on -- maybe on request for proposals or whatever. I think the committee's recommendations are sought by council members. I really look to advisory committees for a broader base and I think that it could be economical. It wouldn't have to be real extravagant, but it could be an economical but very useful tool to the regional council.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, not to go into details of what Jack was saying, but I had on my agenda to attend some of these committee meetings but also agency staff. And the one in particular I don't know why that didn't happen. But I did want to give you a status report of the relationship between the State coordinator and myself.

We're in dialogue all the time. He has made a commitment to cover Federal issues like I did when I was in his position before, but you have to remember that they answer to the Board of Game and Board of Fisheries, those schedules generate certain time lines and et cetera. So that commitment is subject to that and that's what Greg's going to look at to see where there's some room in there. So I want to let you know that your State coordinator for Western Interior is very supportive, he's looking at these as just issues and then from there decide if they're Federal or State. So -- but that's his own personal -- yeah, that's his own personal decision, so that's something to be aware of. And just so it's clear to everyone, because I know Greg doesn't know the G.A.S.H. area pretty well, there were three of -- three or four of the committee members on line just to make.....

MR. BOS: On teleconference?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, just to make it clear. But still what he brought up was important, they were not actually a committee at that time and et cetera and they did address the issues at their joint meetings, but still that is a point that needs to be done, but just so it's clear that we didn't oversee that Ken Chase, the chair of that committee, was on line and a couple of other members of that committee were on line during that teleconference.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Harold.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. I've been on the State Fish & Game advisory board around four or five years and it's always been a couple of people that's, you know, dominating the meeting

in the proposals end and they're mostly concerned, you know, with other things besides subsistence. You know, they have to worry about sport hunters, sport fishers and you know, everybody else and subsistence is not their number one priority. And I don't think we should be handicapping this board by getting them involved in what's already organized, you know. I think we're on a good -- we're on a good track right now and we should keep it up and not get side tracked because, you know, I think you get too many politicians in there and you know, you get away from your main goal. That's my feeling. I've never had any, you know, really good working relationship with the State on -- for subsistence and I don't think they treat our view -- since, you know, since Statehood. So I don't really want to see too much involvement from the local State Fish & Game boards.

MR. REAKOFF: I was referring to the Koyukuk River advisory committee, practically the whole advisory committee is made up by subsistence users.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, well, that's probably one of the few committees that I know of that, you know, you can rely on.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. HUNTINGTON: But everybody else is so mixed up, you know, more walks of life on the committees and subsistence is not their number one priority. So I don't want -- really want them to get too heavy involved in our business.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Yes. I'd like to make a few comments about -- I've been on the Sky (indiscernible) River advisory committee since it first formed in 1972. And we have been very active over the 20 year period and we're always making recommendations to the Game Board and writing proposals. We always fighting for our way of life, for a subsistence life style and to this day we're still doing it and advisory committees are very helpful to the Game Board and could be to the regional council.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: My experience is similar. I've been

on the McGrath one since it's inception in the early '70s and currently am chair. And we haven't had a lot of formal like developing proposals for this because we don't have as much Federal land right around McGrath, but what we do is every time we meet we have Innoko Refuge, usually somebody's represented at the meeting so we find out what's going on in the Upper Innoko since it's adjacent to our area and part of that area is utilized. And I would -- yeah, I think that the Federal agencies should be encouraged, when asked, to send representatives to those meetings so there is direct reporting, that's one thing that could be done. You said nobody was there, so yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: Tim Osborne, the area biologist was the only one there.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But the committees probably vary in terms of their involvement and interest like in Harold's experience. In some areas if there isn't as much Federal land right there maybe they have other interests too, they have a broader -- I suppose a listing of those committees -- we could make sure that a letter goes out to them so that they know officially when we're meeting and something -- or what our agenda is or something like that could be.....

MR. MATHEWS: That's being done now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: I failed to mention that earlier. All the advisory committees statewide, now your area I'm keeping current lists, so I'm only speaking for my area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: The coordinator with the State gives me a current list, as you know, committees there's a rotation of members in there. But all the members of the committees for Eastern and Western Interior received the announcements of the meeting and they received the proposal packet, not the analysis, but the other. They're given that in there. But again, like

someone said earlier, I can't remember what it was, you kind of -- the video discussion, I mean you have this book where do you start, what chapter's important, et cetera. The State has its inch thick book and we have our half inch thick one and someone else's, it's difficult, but that is being provided to them.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm also thinking about what Harold's saying, I'm in reference to the rural advisory committees, I'm not talking about, like the Fairbanks advisory committee had all kinds of anti-subsistence proposals. So I'm not talking about the urban advisory committees, I'm talking about the rural State advisory committee.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think what Harold is saying, each committee's a little bit different and I've worked with the 14 of Interior and they range from the Koyukuk on one end, which is 110 percent subsistence to -- to Fairbanks which is five percent subsistence, let's say and then some are 50 percent, et cetera, and that's what he's addressing there, that sometimes their recommendations would be a little hard to interpret where they're coming from. And he also mentions the politics, some of the committees have, in my opinion, handicapped by the politics of the area of what's going on in that. Again, looking at if this process were to support them, that may address that handicap and may alleviate it. But again, that -- we don't know until we get down that road.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think if the regional, like our council, if we took the lead in this we might alleviate some problems. Like I was thinking of this area over on the Yukon, if there's meetings now between Unit 18 and the others, we might ask that G.A.S.H. be represented and would you then be free to pay for a member down because the State's not likely to. See they're not interested in that, so -- but if we were the ones to initiate that, saying we'd like to have a meeting of those communities and we'd like to see them represented, that if there was a way of Federally facilitating that.

MR. MATHEWS: There would be a way, but again.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS:I'm not making commitment that there would be dollars.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: But the issue would generate it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right, right.

MR. MATHEWS: I went back to my supervisor after yesterday's discussion on, I can't remember what it was, but it was a funding question, would the board provide -- something to do with 21(E) and (F) and he said you laid it out correctly, that the issue was generated so we don't have to go through a series of proposals that occupy a lot of time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: But it would be issue generated. I would think that it would be -- if the Council made it clear to the agency that they wanted advisory committees present that they would be seriously looked at. And they'd be looked at in the best light, the same way that in some areas I've not been involved in the cooperative agreements and that, but we assist with funding, travel through the area of non-profits to get individuals present. And I'm not familiar with all those details, maybe Greg does, but I know on the Y-K we have cooperative agreements with AVCP, we have a cooperative agreement -- George is going now with the council of Athabasican tribal governments, Stan was the representative here through that process -- Stan Sheppard from the Lower Yukon risk management, so there is ways, but I can't guarantee it. But if the issue is one that desires that a good solution requires it, I think the money will be found. And you are correct, the State is not looking at any additional monies for advisory committees that I know of. I don't think there would be anymore with the

present climate.

MR. BOS: Which certainly is.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Greg.

MR. BOS: With almost any issue there is good and bad sides of it and I think I'd have to look at it -- evaluate it on balance to decide whether it would be beneficial for your Council to have a more structured and coordinated approach to the advisory committees. I think Harold raises some good concerns that have been raised by others and that is that interests other than subsistence would come to be represented more before the councils. But then that's also been the criticisms of the existing council process. For example, on the Kenai Peninsula, the criticism was raised that there was nobody speaking for residents of the Kenai who are not presently classified as being rural. And on the other hand there's been several councils that have expressed the need to have access to the advisory committees for one -- in one type of situation that the advisory committees provide a channel to subsistence users where the members of the council don't originate or don't know much about the resources or the uses in an area and they would then rely on the advisory committee to provide that information. So it expands a network available to the councils to reach its subsistence users in -- you know, through the region. There are -- you mentioned an approach that would be an alternative we could consider and that is, instead of having advisory committees deal with every issue before the Federal board, before the councils, is to just select, you know, those issues of particular concerns where you need -- you know, identify a need for particular input from the advisory committees and go to those, that's sort of a middle of the road approach.

So what we hope to do is to lay some of these things out for you in the fall and see if it's possible to adjust time lines so that -- so that in those areas where we want to have advisory committees deal with proposals before the Federal program that their meetings are timed so that they're able to provide that input. This year, for example, many of those meetings took place in the fall before the Federal proposals

were even available to review, so we have to see if it's possible to align the two calendars to get that cross coordination and input. And it's possible that we could go differently within -- for separate regions, you know, one region may feel there's not much need to get more involved with advisory committees, the present operations are satisfactory. Others may want to have much more expanded or structured approach. But we want to look at this, I guess, initially from a statewide.....

MR. REAKOFF: That's right.

MR. BOS:evaluation and then go from there.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Other comments? Yeah, William.

MR. DERENDOFF: I believe I'm also in the same boat with Jack and Pollock because I'm also a member for the Krakuk River advisory. But there are parts in there, I think, that would be important to work together with the State Fish & Game advisory and subsistence Federal board, especially on parts -- and critical parts like distinguishing the high water marks and those -- and those areas. They have to be -- they have to work together in those areas, I mean I would think so. And I -- but there is -- I don't know how to say this really, but you know a lot of these Fish & Game advisory have proposals from the State, but -- and then the Federal also has proposals.....

MR. REAKOFF: Right.

MR. DERENDOFF:right there. And then -- I have to see some kind of commission on how they got to work together. I mean that's what I think.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's a good point because that's the other side. That sometimes we can propose something that would deal with Federal lands, but State lands are involved too and by using the advisory committees, you can ask them to put in a parallel proposal that would put things into line, that's something we can't do, well, I guess we could turn it into the State. But if it came through a State advisory committee it

would probably bear more weight.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, the timing on that would be a little bit more advantageous now that the State system is under a regional per gain, so that there may be that. Timing would still be difficult, but it may be advantageous at your fall meeting if we make those those topic ones, that then we, you know, start lining up stuff there to say well, if we take this action here and we need to take this action with the State and if representatives of the advisory committee are there then they can buy into that to make sure, so there is that. Let's see it's two years before they come back to Interior, I believe it is, the Board of Game, and we won't even talk about fisheries.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: I had one more comment. We cover a vast area, I think that the Western Interior Region 6 is -- we cover a vast area and within that boundary line, I don't know how many State Fish & Game committees are within the area, but I'm saying is that if each advisory committee do their homework well then I think it would -- our job would be a lot easier.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And again, I guess, if we control or can setup topics -- I could see a case where the one we were discussing on the Koyukuk River, at some point it might be advantageous to have a representative from the Fairbanks group there so that they can hear your concerns, not that you're solving it, I mean they may have another -- different -- flip side on that, but it's good to have dialogue so that they realize people are concerned about wanton waste, they're concerned about conflict and you can see the numbers in the growing and maybe it'd help to take that message back to theirs and try to work on it. Because I would think they would be concerned about wanton waste, too, you know. And what kind of proposal could we generate that wouldn't be viewed as rural versus urban or something that would solve the problem. But it's probably going to be hard to just setup a system that says automatically that -- it's something like when the Federal government looked at the State regional councils, they decided they were not adequate, they wanted another one. I think some

of those may have been close to meeting your needs, but other ones were not, it's kind of like that with the advisory committees. Some are more attuned to what we're doing and others are not.

So it's pretty hard to put together a formal system that says automatically they would have this role or they would come and sit in on meetings or something like that.

Harold.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Well, I don't know if you exactly want to hear this, but I think it's -- we're in the situation we're in right now because of the State, you know. They've been against subsistence from day one. And, you know, the rural people have been fighting for subsistence for a long time and what do we do on any kind of board, you know, you've always had the other side that's counteracting you, you know. Like one of the chairmans brought up at one of our meetings last year on -- during the Federal subsistence board meeting here that as -- while he was on the board, you know, Alaska Game Board, he said they would come up with solutions and then the State would come up with counter solutions. You know, that's the way it worked, it's still like that. And I'd like to get away from under their umbrella I guess. We've got to get away from their authority somehow and this is our opportunity otherwise we're just going to be taking a step backwards. Right now I think we're moving forward in a positive direction for subsistence and I'd hate to see any roadblocks in the way.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I hear what you're saying. But my experience, again, speaking back to it before was that we were able to do under the State system a number of things that helped because we were concerned about subsistence. I mean the State did pass the subsistence priority.

MR. HUNTINGTON: But the State, they did -- they turned it down.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I understand, not everybody's for that, but at the same time with that in place we were able to

get winter seasons that were just for local subsistence hunters and so on. And then when it was thrown out of court it didn't work, but there were cases where our advisory committee was able to impact and get things passed by the board that met our needs.

MR. HUNTINGTON: But you have to fight, scratch or kick for everything you got.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, yeah, that's right. Because you're -- there are other people.....

MR. HUNTINGTON: But it shouldn't have to be like that, you know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I guess in a Democracy everybody has a voice and that's it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, but under Federal law.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. HUNTINGTON:you know, we got a law now.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. HUNTINGTON: that pretty well explains it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. On Federal lands, yeah, right.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Enough said, I guess here.

MR. HUNTINGTON: And I'd hate to see roadblocks, you know, thrown in there by the State, you know. And that's what I can't get across to a lot of our people that's on the board, the State Game Board that's on the State local advisory boards, you know. They're actually shooting theirself in the foot really by cooperating with the State. And I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, okay. Yeah. We could have a further discussion sometime.

MR. MATHEWS: And I think.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, I think that's it.

MR. MATHEWS:unless.....

MR. BOS: Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The next agenda item we pretty much covered but I just want to reemphasize under Tab 10 is the full listing of all that have applied for all 10 regions. Your region is Region 6. You can take a look at that, decide that you want to write a letter of recommendation on one of those individuals, the Council can do it, et cetera. So you have that.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What's the tab?

MR. MATHEWS: Tab 10.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Tab 10.

MR. MATHEWS: He didn't put page numbers on it, a couple of pages in.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We're Region 5 are we, no, what's.....

MR. REAKOFF: Six.

MR. MATHEWS: Six.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Six, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: You have three seats that are up. The three seats are Jack, Rays and Pollocks. You have, if I counted right, 11 people applying including the incumbents. And you can see there's a scattering across the region of people applying.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Vince, did you say 11?

MR. MATHEWS: I think it's 11 that applied. I don't know if I counted right.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I see only six.

MR. MATHEWS: Region 6 there was 11 applicants or did I miscount them. I think it's a mistake -- that's a mistake. I'll have to talk to Moses who put that in there, but those are repeats, so two from 11 is nine, so we have nine applicants.

MR. SIMON: Vince, you know, I told you earlier, last month that I filled out one of the forms.....

MR. MATHEWS: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. SIMON:and isn't that the State there -- form?

MR. MATHEWS: Right. I think -- what happened is you just got double entried, so that needs to be corrected, but anyways.

MR. SIMON: Yeah. And then you -- when we talked and you told me to fill out another form.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MR. SIMON: Yeah, this -- that's how this happened.

MR. MATHEWS: That's what happened. But it shouldn't have been double entried, but it was by oversight. So that's it for the nomination one. If there's -- some councils just review them, some pass actions, it's up -- you know, it's clear on that.

The next issue, unless I don't see anybody, is the review and comment on the State of Alaska's Summary of Possible Alaska Solution to the Subsistence Impasse. You were sent a copy of that, yes, I sent you a copy. The State supposedly sent

you a copy, I sent you a copy and you have a copy under Tab 9. John summarized it pretty well what -- if you want to make comments on it as an individual or as a Council, on Page 5 is the address for Fran Ulmer, the Lieutenant Governor. I also, with permission of your chair, passed out a letter from the Southeast Regional Advisory Council, they formed a subcommittee and by the scope of their letter spent a lot of time on it and that's this letter here.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I'd recommend that you read through that because they've commented on some things that you might agree with.

MR. MATHEWS: It's up to you. The deadline for comments was March 1st, but this is a fluid process I think what John was saying and if you do have comments -- John Morrison of Alaska Department of Fish & Game -- as individuals or as representative of another group or this group could comment on it.

And with that, I don't think there's a representative here.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It was handed around.

MR. MATHEWS: I have other copies if Jack doesn't have one.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It's got holes in it too, it's punched.

MR. MATHEWS: Let me see if I can.....

MR. REAKOFF: I got it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Does anyone that wants to look into it now or comment on it now as a committee?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, I'll make one comment on it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think it would be a step backwards for us, that's it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I haven't had a chance to review it myself and I don't have any comments at this point.

MR. MATHEWS: And if you would like, from the commissioner's office they will keep us, the coordinators with current copies, drafts, if you want I could just automatically send it to you. They -- it wasn't clear to me, I believe they were sending it to the chairs and then I heard from someone else they were sending it to the whole council, but mailing lists are a nightmare to deal with on any level, so if you would like, if I get a copy I can -- if there's a further draft -- John kind of intimated that it's not sure how much further this is going to go on.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I received two copies but it wasn't clear whether it was chair of this, because I'm on the local Fish & Game advisory, too and I didn't pay that much attention to the labels. Did any of the others receive it directly from the State?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Vince, you sent me one?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I thought I did.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince did, but I mean the State, Vince. They probably weren't using our list then.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I got it from Vince.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. So I think it would be good, I guess, if there is a new draft developed that you'd send it out.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And more important, I think, if other committees take action, I think it would be good to see that.....

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS:if they're commenting on it, like Southeast, so we can follow what their arguments are.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. I don't know of any that have, but we will have a brief -- to Southeast -- that's what you have in front of you, the Bill Thomas letter. I don't know of any other councils. But Bristol Bay is meeting next week. It was a difficult thing for us to deal with because it's State and Federal government, so everyone has been -- you know, has been hesitating a lot.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. You don't want us to send you down there to argue against it then?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't mind. You just -- I have to have some kind of authority behind it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: It's the position of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife that subsistence management be under one managing agency. But I concur with Harold on that it's crossing a real thin ice to try to get into the ANILCA law and try to change, by legislative action in the Alaska legislature. I think subsistence is bound in that -- in that, what'd she call it, Subsistence Alaska Solution to the Subsistence Impasse. So far what I've read in that, seen on the news and read through -- I read through one document of this and it looked like it was too risky for subsistence. It's not a -- the subsistence users in Alaska are bound to lose. I personally haven't seen anything that would address what the true subsistence users would lose compared to what they would gain. They would gain nothing, they would lose quite a bit.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other comments? Hearing none,

then we'll move on.

MR. MATHEWS: That's the remaining item, unless I missed a new business one, is future meeting plans.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Where would you like to meet -- false, that's going too fast. Let's set a time first before where you want to meet. If you look past your agenda under Tab 1 there's a calendar. That's the window, I understand a lot of that window is during hunting season, but the window is from September 8th through October 19th. I'm requesting that if you could give me like a week of time or several time slots so in case we can't get logistics or if it conflicts with another meeting or something. Right now, not that you -- well, Eastern Interior selected the week of October 7th through the 11th. They're not meeting that whole week, they've left it up to me in consultation with the chair to pick the best dates in that week. That's kind of what I'm getting at is if you give us a window -- the reason they do that is like the issue 21(E) and 19(A) of Y-K -- Yukon Kuskokwim meets, maybe it'd be better not to overlap or maybe it would be good to overlap, I don't know. But if we're locked into certain dates, then there may not be a chance. Meaning maybe that at that time there'd be a joint meeting, I don't know. Or maybe a subcommittee from one committee would go -- council would go to the other and vice versa, so that's where we need to watch on overlap.

I can't think of anything on the North Slope, I can't think of anything on Eastern. And let's see your other adjoining one is what, Southcentral -- no Bristol Bay, I don't know of any there. So it's mainly Y-K that there seems to me you're going to need to do some coordination and dialogue there.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: October is going to be a busy month for me. There might be three meetings for me in that month, Fish Board and National Park and local advisory committee. So check with Jim Marcott or check with you.....

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

MR. SIMON:because we have the meetings scheduled in October, too, our local advisory committee.

MR. MATHEWS: There is a possibility there like we did in Huslia where the committee meets the day and a half before we met and then we came into town.

MR. REAKOFF: It was immediately preceding the regional council.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I mean that's an option that that could happen. I don't know if Jim has set the dates for October, so I.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do you know where it's going to take place?

MR. SIMON: Bettles.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Bettles, um.

MR. SIMON: That's the advisory committee.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The last few years we've been having meetings kind of late in the fall and the weather's been really bad for flying. I'd rather have it a little early this year when the weather's better or something. Because it's either, you know, freezing rain or snowing by the time the middle October comes around when we usually have our meetings. I'd like to see it a little earlier this time.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, it leaves September, that last week or the first week of October.

MR. REAKOFF: Moose -- moose season's open until the 25th of September and that's.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. REAKOFF:and I'd like to see this September 30th week myself.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Through October 4?

MR. SIMON: That sounds great.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Do we want to just set that week and leave it open and then try to fine tune it later? If that's acceptable, then could you let us know towards the end of summer, at least, any conflicts you have or other meetings so that we can kind of look for common ground? Like we need to know those other meetings and we could turn those into Vince. What -- any other comments?

MR. SIMON: This meeting in Anchorage is good, we come to a big city, but I expressed before that I like to go out and meet people that I represent before and I prefer to be meeting in the villages that we represent.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, we had the situation where we weren't able to get to Holy Cross, so that could be another consideration. We have never been way north like Allakaket and McGrath is open again, we've met there once before. But there aren't -- I don't know of issues that are coming up in that area. But in terms of being able to get in, it's not a bad place. What are your thoughts? Angela, let's defer to you, what do you -- I mean I'd like to hear your comments.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Let's not try Holy Cross again.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You would?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I would not want to try Holy Cross again.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I mean it's canceled two times. Somebody's trying to tell us something, you know, if it canceled those two times.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, okay. Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I would suggest Galena. There's quite a bit of villages around that area that people can come to the meetings. We have real good participation when we have a Galena meeting. We had the Aniak meeting and now I think it's better to get back more to the center of the region. And there's some -- I think there's quite a bit of concerns down in the -- down in Harold's country there and I think that's probably a better place for our meeting, I think.

MR. MATHEWS: Just a note, not to change your thoughts. Remember we were going to target -- our topic issue for fall was going to be 21(E), 19(A), it still could go on in Galena, I'm just saying that we were going to do a kind of wide open look at those areas.

MR. REAKOFF: The teleconference I think worked really good, can that be done in Galena?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't see why not. But -- I mean they have phones in there, that's all we need on that. And then if this much lead time and the intensity of those issues down there.....

MR. REAKOFF: Right.

MR. MATHEWS:even on the Kuskokwim, that those groups may send representatives up to Galena. Anytime you get -- I don't know where the dividing line is, but the southern part of your region is all hubbed out of Aniak and Bethel and the northern part's all hubbed out of Fairbanks, so no matter where you go it's a nightmare for travel, I want to make that clear. There's those that have gone around the whole pier, from the north and those that have gone back again, it's just really a nightmare.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think it's Fairbanks out here and around -- the same with Holy Cross.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MR. HUNTINGTON: There is -- I think there is starting to be a direct flight from Anchorage to Galena now. I think it's starting in April.

MR. MATHEWS: If that would help with Angela, Henry, Gail if there was a direct flight and yourself. If there was one at Anchorage -- but anyways those are considerations.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I don't know if we'll necessarily be trying to settle this issue in the fall. I would assume that we will try to have a meeting before then with those groups involved and let them talk it out. I don't see getting them altogether at our meeting and trying to solve that problem, I think it's going to have to be -- maybe they'll develop a proposal that'll come to us at that time.

MR. MATHEWS: It's possible. We'll have to see how the board addresses this. And when you meet with -- you'll be there for the one with the -- at that time, I think is when the two chairs will discuss where to go from here. When you say the groups will meet, that's where it starts falling down, I don't know. I know the Lower Yukon moose management group has been real assertive on this. In the Holy Cross area I don't know what group that would be, maybe the advisory committee, maybe other groups. So that's something that would be -- and that's why it scares me when you say some groups, because then what happens is no one picks up the ball and then we're back here a year from now going well, I thought the groups were going to meet. But I think after -- what the board does will dictate that.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair, could there be two meetings, maybe a down river one and an up river one? Maybe we could go down river and hear what the down river people have to say and then have the down river come into Shageluk -- because Shageluk's the one that's really being impacted by the -- have

the meeting in Shageluk.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's a suggestion, if there was a couple of meetings, rather than try it in one place.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Because if we go down there, obviously there'd be more participation of AVCP and the others. They had all their villages together and we were going to send a representative down there, but then they're the ones that were heavily attending the meeting.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, that's a possibility.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'll approach that with the chair of that council, I guess, when we go to Fairbanks.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Have it held in Shageluk because they're the ones who are getting most of the hunters in that area. Let them really see what subsistence living is and how much Shageluk depends on the moose meat. Shageluk, of the four villages, I think is one of the most economically depressed of the four villages.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Probably the most traditional over there in terms of lifestyle.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And the most traditional. They still have their own dancing, they have their own language and they still carry water and they still use outhouses and they're really, really traditional people over there. They have a meeting place for just traditional stuff and meeting places for white man stuff, like what we're doing here.

MR. SIMON: I have one more comment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Around my area and Jack's area we're kind of spread out quite a bit. There's no villages that are like down

around Galena or down around Holy Cross, but I would suggest that some of these board members they haven't been to my area and Jack's area. I would suggest that sometime in the near future we should hold it really somewhere in that area -- around my area. Of course I have been down to Galena and down to Aniak, I haven't been to McGrath yet, but I have seen some parts of the lower area. And I would suggest that they see the northern part of the areas, the north country to see some of the people there. As far as meeting in Galena sounds real good to me.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We've got a week. Galena's been suggested. Other comments on that? Is that agreeable?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Don't look at me always?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, you got comments. Would you like to throw in some other place?

MS. VANDERPOOL: No, I'm fine with that. The first week of October?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And we've tended to go towards the end of the week, that works better for my schedule, but I don't know about other peoples.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Is there a moose hunt -- we can't have it the third week because of the convention?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: The third week of October is AFN?

MS. VANDERPOOL: AFN.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah, that's a busy week.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And the second week was when one of the other meeting -- and Vince has to help prepare for that, I

assume.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Don't you have a clone?

MR. MATHEWS: No, no clones.

MS. VANDERPOOL: All right.

MR. MATHEWS: And there's no clones for your biologist, Conrad or for your social scientist, George.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All right. Then we'll say Galena unless things come up and sometime during that week.

MR. REAKOFF: I also would like to see a meeting up toward the upper country. And a lot of people don't understand that country, it's a different kind of country, open -- you know, open villages, just.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Mild time of year up there, have a good spring?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, the spring meeting would be probably good. It's usually nice weather.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Remember we were trying to meet in February before but we were running into travel, so maybe either late February or early March for that spring meeting next year or something like that.

MR. SIMON: It's good that we have some meetings in February because March, there's a lot of meetings to attend, too.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, that's true.

MR. SIMON: If you hold off the meetings until March,

then there's a couple more meetings that kind of are a week apart or something.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, but if we get too early in February you run into that cold, 40 below or something like that, I know even in McGrath, then people have trouble. I know we pulled it off in Huslia there, it wasn't too bad.

MR. REAKOFF: After the 15th of March you get the warm up in the daytime.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So you're saying later in March?

MR. REAKOFF: I mean, not in March, February.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: February, okay.

MR. SIMON: Just like this is kind of short notice because we didn't go to Holy Cross for the fact that we're meeting here this week.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. SIMON:and Henry's meeting in Fairbanks.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I know, I apologize for that. We had to -- we tried to keep it as close to the other one as possible. We tried the next week and then that didn't work again, so we had to -- I can't remember, there was some reason we didn't try last week, we had to wait two weeks. Was there.....

MR. MATHEWS: I don't remember the reasons for that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's the toughest thing as chairs when we have to start moving meetings because I know it affects everybody else's calendar.

MR. MATHEWS: Last week was because of the Fort Yukon meeting and your staff was all in Fort Yukon.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I knew there was something.

All right. Is there a motion to that effect then, we will meet during the week of September 30th in Galena for our fall meeting?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So moved.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, moved by Angela, second?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Gail, okay. Discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes votes for all members present, motion carries.

We are down to -- any other topics, issues, subject any of the members want to bring up? Things you want on the future agendas worked on?

MR. MATHEWS: And for William, the draft agenda goes out way ahead of time, that's wide open when that draft agenda goes out, if there's something you want added, refined, thrown out, you have at -- to do that. And what happens is I feed it to the chair or you can call the chair up directly.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, either way.

MR. MATHEWS:on that. So that agenda, when it's sent out as a draft, it's not meant to be, you know, locking anybody in. It's a heads-up thing, that this is what we're thinking about talking about if you want it. Do you want it, do you want more, whatever.

MR. DERENDOFF: That would be the procedure I would go through if I was going to do some changing, you or the chair?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. If it's easier for you and more comfortable, contact the chair and under one of these tabs is a list -- right after the calendar, two pages back, is a list of the members and phone numbers. We'll have to experiment on this, but I think what you can do is you can charge your call, like if you call, you can charge that call to the Fairbanks

number, it'd be -- well, it's 456-0406. Or you can call me up and then I contact the chair. The chair is the one that -- is the only one that has a phone credit card, so I believe our phone number in Fairbanks is open-ended so you could charge to it. So if you called Harold about a council issue you could charge it to that number.

MR. DERENDOFF: Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: And then I'll monitor it.

MR. DERENDOFF: What did he say the number is, did you give me the number?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay, the number -- the 800 number to reach me is 800-478-1456.

MR. DERENDOFF: That's right now?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, it's right now. Yeah, it calls Anchorage -- there is an 800 number in Fairbanks, but I don't remember right now and I'll have an announcement -- I'm not sure if that's died or just floating there. But once the office is moved to Fairbanks, there'll be an 800 number there. But some of you may, for whatever reason, would be more comfortable to talk to the chair, that line is open. But the line for agencies is try to go through me and then back -- because of the fact that the actual generation of the agenda is done by myself. And Ray and I are in good communication. Some of the other chairs, it's just because of the way they live and their lifestyle it's really hard to get communication, rapid, meaning in a day or two, just because people are busy, they're out on their trap line or whatever.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: My numbers are 524-3074, that's my work number and you can leave a message there if I don't happen to be in. 524-3074, and then my home number is 524-3512 in the evening. I think they're both there, so you have it there.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, they're both here.

MR. SIMON: 524 what is your home?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: 3512.

MR. SIMON: 3512.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And there's an answering machine on that one if we happen to be out. The other one is the University number at the University Center there and the secretary there, they'll take messages and get them to me if I happen to be gone. Well, thank you all. I think we're ready to adjourn.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have one -- just a comment on logistics. I missed the last couple meetings because I think the staff's been scheduling them too close to the departure like this, go to Fairbanks and 20 minutes later I'm supposed to be on the jet down here, Fairbanks don't work like that. Fairbanks (indiscernible) an hour later than, so next time schedule me at least two days ahead.

MR. MATHEWS: All right. We'll look into it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: That's about it.

MR. MATHEWS: If anyone has questions on their travel I have that here, what plane you're taking and all that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We're adjourned.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

*** * * * ***

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby

certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 121 through 260 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the **Western Interior Regional Advisory Council Meeting,** meeting taken electronically by me on the 13th day of March, 1996, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at the Regal Alaska Hotel, Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by myself and Salena Hile to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 21st day of March, 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 10/10/98